DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 257 CE 035 276

AUTHOR Whaples, Gene C., Comp.; Rivera, William M., Comp.
TITLE Policy Issues and Process. Issues in Education for Adults, #1.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Dept. of Agriculture and Extension Education.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 73p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, Room 0220 Symons Hall, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Adult Learning; Educational Change; Educational Needs; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); Humanism; Humanistic Education; *Lifelong Learning; *Policy Formation; Politics; Postsecondary Education; *Public Policy

ABSTRACT

This publication, the first of a planned series, is intended to advance discussion by professionals and, hopefully, the public about education for adults--its purposes, control, and programs. Four essays are included, each with a distinct theme and purpose. However, all the essays relate to the major issues in adult education, national policy, lobbying, and a human policy with respect to adult education. The first essay, by William M. Rivera, examines definitions of adult education and educational policy by distinguishing certain directions in the field and by underscoring that adult education is more than a field of study and practice; it is an arena of political controversy and complex policymaking. In the second essay, William Hilton reviews the political position and purposes of the Education Commission for the States and sets up model guidelines of how to formulate policy. His essay introduces a major issue, i.e., should there be a comprehensive adult education policy at the federal level? Mariam Kazanjian's paper, third in the booklet, clarifies the federal and state interactive processes of policymaking, while the final paper by Warren L. Ziegler discusses a fully human policy of education, recognizing the drawbacks as well as benefits of providing education for adults as a public policy. His paper also questions the value of continuing to insist on distinctions between children/youth and adults with respect to educational policy and explores the implications of abandoning these distinctions. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227257

ISSUES IN EDUCATION FOR ADULTS, #1

POLICY ISSUES AND PROCESS

COMPILED AND EDITED

BY

GENE C. WHAPLES & WILLIAM M. RIVERA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Rivera

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 035 276

Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, University of Maryland at College Park, Copyright 1982.

CONTENTS

Preface..... ii

Acknowledgements..... ii

Introduction..... iv

Reflections on Policy Issues in Adult Education..... 1
By: William M. Rivera

Toward a Comprehensive Policy for the Education of Adults.... 23
By: William J. Hilton

Policy Development and the Lobbying Process for Education of Adults..... 32
By: Miriam A. Kazanjian

The Quest for a Fully Human Policy for the Education of Adults..... 47
By: Warren L. Ziegler

PREFACE

This is the first in what is planned to be a periodic publication dealing with current areas of concern for those who are interested in education for adults. It is intended that those topics which are the most contraversial will be selected especially those relating to adult educational policy, planning, program development and evaluation. Individuals with divergent opinions and approaches who are recognized as spokespersons for the field will be selected and invited to present their positions. You are encouraged to bring to our attention issues that should be presented through this publication. We also encourage you to identify those individuals who you feel can contribute to the discussion of particular critical issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to thank first of all the contributors to this volume, for their work in readying their manuscripts for publication and for their patience. We also want to thank, for her work and patience, our diligent and cheerful secretary, Christine Sines. To the many who helped during the early stages of this series' development, again our thanks.

INTRODUCTION

The education system, while slow to change, has not been reluctant to grow and expand. Since WWII, several new educational institutions have come on the scene: community colleges, middle schools, pre-schools, etc. While educational policy is always policy for the educational system, it must be recognized that the system itself is changing and expanding.

In America today, education for adults--both government sponsored and private educational opportunities--is such an important enterprise that the United States is often called "The Learning Society." Paradoxically, it has also been indicted for being "the Ignorant Society," in that as people are learning more they know less since knowledge is becoming more highly specialized. Moreover, American society has only recently come to recognize the reality of some 60 million adults without high school experience or basic and secondary educational skills.

The phenomenon of adult learning in America is not new, indeed some claim it was more active proportionate to population at the turn of the century and in the 1930's.

Government has been involved since the very beginnings in the public service and control of adult education. Initially agricultural production was a main reason for government's involvement in education for adults. The Cooperative Extension movement's impact on the United States has been and continues to be significant. Early in our history the military engaged in educating adults. Immigration was another stimulus for government intervention into education for adults, moving it toward a national enterprise.

It was during WWI that Adult (Basic) Education was fully recognized as a national need, especially for immigrants and migrants, the poor and unskilled. Shortly after the War, the concept of a field and practice, as well as of a discipline, regarding education for adults and adult learning, took form in the shape of an association. "Although the education of adults has been a cultural function since ancient times," states Malcolm S. Knowles, "it was not until the founding of the American Association of Adult Education in 1926 that adult education was conceived of as a delineated field in this country." Indeed, it was at this time that one of the great moments in the history of the movement took place at the AAAE annual meeting held in Cleveland in 1927, when Edward L. Throndike reported for the first time his findings that the ability to learn declined very slowly and very slightly after age twenty.

As Malcolm S. Knowles points out, since the 1920's the field has been growing and changing so dynamically that is has been almost impossible to keep up with statistics or its

character. "Indeed," he says, "institutionally sponsored adult education is the fastest growing aspect of our national educational enterprise in the last quarter of the century. And it is growing not only horizontally--reaching a greater and greater proportion of our adult population, but vertically --taking over institutions that heretofore served only youth."

Institutionally sponsored adult education, however, began much earlier than the 1920's, just as the roots of the movement reach much farther than the last half century. Agricultural (Cooperative) Extension Services had their start in the Land Grant Colleges created by the George-Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which set up Agricultural Experimental Stations. The Mechanics Institutes, beginning in 1831, imported and adapted from England, provided an important educational resource for workers in this country. The first library in the United States was a direct outgrowth of Benjamin Franklin's Junto which was the first known informal discussion program in America, started in 1730. As we look back beyond the Morrill Act of 1862, adult education activities appear to be essentially informal activities. However, the U. S. Government established its concern for public education very early with The Northwest Territory Act of 1795. The earliest evidence of federal funds for adult education, according to the 1980 report of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education was made in 1797 for the purpose of providing instruction in mathematics and military skills to soldiers of the Continental Army. These precedents serve to clarify the origins for government involvement in public education and for publicly sponsored adult education. Since the end of WWII and up to 1980 this involvement continuously increased but was then sharply curtailed by the Reagan Administration.

The impact of legislation on Adult Education as a practice and as a discipline cannot be overestimated. James R. Dorland, former Executive Director of the National Association of Public and Continuing Adult Education (NAPCAE), writes: "The history of adult education in this country cannot be accurately told without referring to the major legislative developments which have exerted so much influence on the adult education movement."

To ignore public policy for adult education is to blindfold the field and set it working around a millstone without understanding what's happening, or why. Adult Education is more than a "how to" profession and requires inquiry into policy and history to be fathomed and interpreted. It is a field that exists within a social, political and economic environment which impacts on it and on which it has, and will probably have more, influence as we enter the 21st century.

* *

The need for a systematic and continuing exploration of public policy as it relates to education for adults suggests that it is time to lay out a clear framework under which reseachers can study. A review of the literature reveals that most discussion of public policy centers on either policy issues or policymaking. Yet the policymaking process is intimately related to that of policy issues, and indeed both concerns appear to be inseparable except for purposes of discussion and analysis. A broad view of the subject of public policy in education is provided by the late Herbert M. Hamlin in The Public and Its Education: a Citizen's Guide to Study and Action in Public Education. Hamlin differentiates and describes public policy according to five basic areas of concern, as follows:

1) Public policy history (and evolution);
2) Public policy issues and process;
3) Public expectations of public policy;
4) Public policy's implementation through planning, program development and delivery of services;
5) Public participation in public education.

Hamlin provides a broad-based view of public policy and education, and his guidelines serve as a strong base for the organization of research in the field of adult education. However, policy analysis--especially as it refers to policy issues, i.e. the disagreements "between two or more elements of a society over the way that the society's government deals with a given condition" --is also often considered from the viewpoint of "types of policy analysis."

Types of policy analysis, as defined by various authors, include at least four major orientations, viz.:

Monitoring (Descriptive), i.e., recording systematically patterns of events and conditions over time;

Forecasting (Predictive), i.e., projecting what patterns might emerge in the future;

Evaluating (Evaluative), i.e., assessing the degree to which conditions and events have become better or worse according to a given set of standards;

Prescribing (Prescriptive), i.e., suggesting and assessing alternative course of actions that are designed to improve conditions according to a given set of standards (Coplin & O'Leary (eds.), Basic Policy Studies, Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.: Policy Studies Associates, 1981, p. 15).

The above types of policy analysis are useful for distinguishing the purposes to which policy research is meant to be applied.

The central problem for research policy, it appears, lies precisely in its particular orientation to the objectives of practical application and relevance to policy decision making. Thus, policy analysis--except perhaps in studies of its history and foundations--is associated with applied rather than basic research; and this, in part, accounts for its lesser place in academe where purists still consider applied research to be tainted, and presumably explains its slow acceptance and development as an area of study within the field of adult education.

Ironically, public policy education in the field of adult education has been carried out between institutions of higher education and the public more than with its students, specifically by the Extension Service. The U.S.D.A. maintains an Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, and its reports cover a broad range of related topics, viz.: the history and philosophy of public policy education, the role of land grant universities and extension, public policy education methodology, the role of public policy specialists, strategies for expanding extension public policy education, staffing for public policy education, and the challenges in public policy education (U.S.D.A. Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, Public Policy Education, Washington, D.C. 1979: 9 p.).

Policy issues are central to any study of policy. Some organize issues into 1) the problems of the "politics of public policy," and 2) the problems of evaluating the effects of public policy (Coplin & O'Leary (eds.), Basic Policy Studies, p. 2). This approach to policy issues essentially asks two questions: Why are certain policies established, while others are defeated, or not even considered at all? and What are the effects, both intended and unintended, of actual policies on various conditions in society? Research into either of these two questions suggests that information be obtained on three specific components: the policy environment, the political actors, and the public policies per se. It requires asking such questions as: a) What is the public policy? b) What is the policy environment? c) Who are the policy actors? d) What influence do the actors exert on the policy? and e) What impact does the policy have on the environment?

While the question of public policy issues--the environment, actors and policies--represents a central concern of public policy research, a parallel and interdependent question is that of the policymaking process toward which much of recent adult education concern has been directed, especially by special interest groups in adult basic education. One adult education policy researcher (DeSanctis, unpubl. syllabus, 1982) organizes policymaking into four major segments, as follows:

a) the policymaking process, i.e., pressures for policy, the process itself, the context (or environment), and the levels of policymaking;

b) the actors in the process, i.e., interest groups, bureaucrats, legislative involvement, advisory bodies, other interested parties (such as foundations and individual authors);

c) the operation of the policy system, i.e., policymaking through subsystems, policy issue networks;

d) policymaking in action, i.e., the attitudes of adult educators, conflict within interest groups, conflict between public and private nonprofit providers;

In addition, DeSanctis asks: What does the future hold for adult education policymaking?

The subject, range and nature of adult education issues and public policy may not be limited by the above designs, but by bringing these designs together under the heading of adult education public policy research, the intent is to provide at least some guidelines to this general area of interest. As public policy is a particularly convoluted area of interest, such guidelines--even if preliminary--provide, hopefully, a stepping stone for further discussion. As public policy analysis is marked by certain special priorities with regard to political decisionmaking, there is no need to justify the importance of research in this area. More importantly, the dramatic changes that are occuring in adult education, especially in recent years but ever since the turn of the century, underscore the urgency for professionals to investigate and debate policy issues as well as to learn to influence and implement policy decisions.

In conclusion, the subject of adult education policy, and particularly public policy, demands greater attention as a discipline for research. As such, definitions in both domains--that of adult education and public policy--require close examination for their meaning. In this regard, the questions of adult education policy and its relationship to adult educational planning and evaluation deserve consideration for their interdependence and the significance of that interdependence. It is not enough for adult educators to speak of a "lifelong learning system" of adult education without meaningfully contrasting and comparing such a projected system with those of continuing and/or recurrent education models.

Numerous issues exist in the field of adult education and they cover major questions associated with the purposes and principles of adult education, the control and influence of

policy for adult education, and the program planning and development in the field (curriculum, methodologies, resource allocations, program distribution). The major areas in which disagreement and conflict exist need to be brought more clearly to the surface not only for consideration within the profession but by the public at large.

* *

The intent of this publication Policy Issues and Process is to advance discussion by professionals and, hopefully, the public about education for adults--its purposes, control and programs.

Four essays are included, each with a distinct theme and purpose. While seeking to provide insights into policy issues and process, each essay asks certain questions:

- What is the major issue in adult education today with regard to public policy?
- How is national policy formed? How should it be formed? Who should be in final authority: federal, state or local government? Does it matter? How?
- How does state lobbying operate in Washington, D.C.? What is the Federal involvement? How does the lobbying process work?
- What would constitute a fully human policy with respect to adult education?

While the present publication developed from the editors' idea of producing a series on contraversial issues, this volume's essays took shape as follow-up to a series of colloquia on adult education and public policy organized in 1980-1981 by William M. Rivera while at Syracuse University.

The first essay, by William M. Rivera, now Associate Professor at the University of Maryland at College Park, examines definitions of adult education and educational policy with a view to distinguishing certain directions in the field and to underscore that adult education is more than a field of study and practice, it's an arena of political contraversy and complex policymaking. It's both a means to advancing adult learning as part of self fulfilment and at the same time serves to foster attainment of the goals of society at large. The essay proposes a classification of policy issues and highlights selected issues pertinent to the future of the field and its professionals. The present direction toward the development of

public policy for the reform and expansion of public education through adult education's integration into the system is a major issue posed by the essay.

William J. Hilton, Director of the Lifelong Learning Project of the Education Commission for the States (ECS) reviews the political position and purposes of the ECS, itself a political institution that grew out of James Bryant Conant's suggestion to create an interstate organization that would make possible a coordinated nationwide policy in America, and sets up model guidelines of how to formulate policy.

Hilton's topic: "Conflict or Partnership: A Comprehensive Policy of Education for Adults" introduces us to a major issue which contains the seed of a continuing argument: should there be a comprehensive policy at the federal level? Should there be a coherent policy between Federal, state and local governments? What should be the scope, purpose and direction of a national education policy for adult lifelong education? Or is it that we require a nationwide, not a national education policy, as James Bryant Conant in Shaping Educational Policy originally argued in the early 1960's? In Conant's words:

> ...without a drastic Constitutional amendment, nobody is in a position to establish and educational policy in the United States. It is my contention that some form of cooperative exploration of educational problems between the states and the Federal government is imperative. We cannot have a national education policy, but we might be able to evolve a nationwide policy.

Miriam Kazanjian, Federal Relations Representative for the New York State Education Department, works in Washington, D.C., and represents the State's educational interests before the U.S. Federal Government. She helps also to interpret measures taken by the President and the Executive Agencies and the Congress to the New York State Education Department. Part of her responsibility is to complete the annual edition of the New York State Regents' series, Federal Legislation and Education in New York State. This series reviews important statutory, budgetary and regulatory issues that shape the Federal role in education and affect state policies and funding. Kazanjian's paper clarifies the federal and state interactive processes of policymaking.

The discussion of a fully human policy recognizes the disbenefits as well as benefits of providing education for adults as a public policy. "What would constitute fully human policy of education for adults?" asks Warren L. Ziegler, President and Executive Director of the Futures-Invention Associates, Denver, Colorado. Ziegler overturns several sacred cows in the intellectual temples of the Adult Education

profession. He questions the value of continuing to insist on distinctions between children/youth and adults with respect to educational policy. His paper explores some of the implications of abandoning these distinctions. The term "fully human policy" is rescued from banality by his careful specifications and by his detailed denial that the objectives captured under that phrase can ever be an object of integral government policy.

The reality of adult education as tied to political philosophy and politics becomes increasingly evident. The "learning society" --a mere slogan for many people--is really the latest stage of the modern Anglo-American philosophic commitment to the development of rational individual citizens prepared by education to participate in the market economy and the political commonwealth. Many adult education professionals, concerned with the daily details of their practice, become impatient with those who would speak to them of the importance of politics and the processes of policy-making at governmental levels. Yet the details of daily practice are threatened with pointlessness if not informed by reasonable larger standards of coordination. Such standards can only reflect some logic of thought and action.

REFLECTIONS ON POLICY ISSUES IN ADULT EDUCATION

BY
William M. Rivera
Associate Professor
University of Maryland at College Park

Adult Education is a practical field of enterprise. Its professionals are primarily program administrators and teachers, including professors of its study, who seek essentially to foster and advance learning and the facilitation of learning among adults. As a field, its concerns with policy, and by extension with politics, tend to focus on policy formation and policymaking. Much of the recent emphasis among its legislatively alert is on political advocacy, or lobbying, and with assuring fellow professionals that "lobbying is not a dirty word" (1, 2).

As the field has widened from marginal terrain into fertile territory, as adult education has metamorphosed into "lifelong learning," as adults themselves have come to be thought of by some as "human resources," political activity--always extant but quieter and connected more to special interests--has become intense. While anyone familiar even peripherally with the development of the Cooperative Extension Service can appreciate, adult education has always been political, political in the sense of Politics: Who Gets What, When, How (3). In other words, in practice adult education has always meant politics; and nothing in this regard has changed.

But something has changed. Today, adult education broadly conceived is no longer a question of special interests--despite its neat slices into such specific domains as adult basic education (ABE/GED), continuing higher education (what used to be called university extension), adult postsecondary (or higher) education, agricultural and consumer extension. Today adult education is a national enterprise, wide-ranging in purpose and implication. Some claim Federal governmental support alone totals upwards of $14 billion (4), including of course more than the policy acts and formula funding for adult education, that is, all the staff development, training and re-training programs undertaken by Federal agencies throughout the land. What has changed is the value afforded education for adults and, too, society's manifest commitment to that value.

Dramatic growth appears to be current in the field of adult education. National estimates claim everywhere from 17 million to 60 million adults engaged in education activities--job training, continuing professional education, workshops, higher education. The percentage of all college students aged 25 years or older has steadily increased until over half of the higher-education population belongs to this once "non-traditional" group. The demand by adults for education,

formal and non-formal, is extensive and even a bit overwhelming. Nevertheless, this dramatic growth is one-sided and, as some have recognized, participation in education by adults--while it spans a wide range of backgrounds, previous educational experiences, and incomes--tends to be greatest within one group: "today's adult learners are disproportionately young, white, educated, and earning salaries above the national medial family income" (5). Indeed, the enthusiasm for adult education, I warrant, is due to the middle-class base it has developed. Despite the outcries of the concerned, it is not the 60 million without high-school diplomas who solicit political interest so much as the 60 million who are already reasonably well educated and who are seeking, by choice and/or social pressure, to continue their education.

To examine the politics of adult education today would require an historical review and current analysis of the social purposes and professional principles regarding education of adults, the past and present policy attitudes and advocacy, and the range of policy developments and practices that have occurred in a field which is not institutionally determined but nevertheless operates pragmatically from a multi-institutional base. This paper is not intended for such a sweeping, in-depth exercise, but nevertheless seeks to provide an overview by skimming the surface. The surface it skims includes a review of definitions and how these have changed over time, leading to certain present views of adult education. In addition, a general classification and review of some major issues is undertaken in part to underline the political nature of the field.

I. Definitions

The term adult education has been described as an "apparently bewildering mosaic" (6). The problem lies in the vastness and diversity of the field in its breadth of study and extent of practice. Accordingly, it means different things to different adult educators and including others concerned with the education of adults. Some think of it as a field of study and practice; for others it's a practice pure and simple--a function; and for others it's a social tool wielded in the upper echelons of government for advancing society. UNESCO defines the diversity of the practice in Learning to Be (7), as follows:

> There are many possible definitions of adult education. For a very large number of adults in the world today, it is a substitute for the basic education they missed. For the many individuals who received only a very incomplete education, it is the complement to elementary or professional education. For those whom it helps respond to new demands which their environment makes on them, it is the prolongation of education. If offers further education to those who have already received

> high level training. And it is a means of individual development for everybody. One or other of these aspects may be more important in one country than in another, but they all have their validity (p. 205).

Utilizing the above definition as a springboard, it is clear that adult education is most often described as an individual, or group, means to an end. The question usually raised is either how people educate themselves or how they are educated.

In the 1970 Handbook of Adult Education, however, Sheats (8) makes the distinction between adult education for self-fulfillment and adult education for maintaining and influencing the direction of social change. He points out that living with and influencing change is a social as well as an individual process that calls for social as well as individual learning. Thus, a dichotomy may be seen between those concerned with the providers and provision of adult education and those focussed on learning directed toward the resolution of social problems. But even this dichotomy obscures a basic reality for the field--that adult education is most often determined, and its social direction defined, by others than adult educators, by public policymakers for instance.

The field of adult education is, as is all educational activity, political in nature. Thus, definitions take on specific philosophical/political meanings. This fact is no more obvious than in the Boyd-Apps text of essays on Redefining the Discipline of Adult Education (1980). As critiqued by Robert A. Carlson, the conceptual model put forward and developed in the book evokes the expression of only one philosophical approach--"a utopian philosophy of adult education that posits the scientific use of institutions to create more perfect individuals and a more perfect society" (9). As Carlson points up, the Boyd-Apps model posits as the purpose of all adult education "individual, group, and community growth;" and defines educational growth" as the learner's ability to progress through a scientific, rational, problem-solving process" (10). Boyd and Apps, as Carlson notes, make two major assumptions: 1) that human beings have the right and the power to change their conditions and will do so in ways that enhance the conditions of all; and 2) that the role of institutions in bringing about this growth or change is crucial. "They appear to assume, or at least to seek, a society in which everyone works to achieve the utopian goal of of the happy, harmonious, abundant, rational life" (11).

Carlson asks bluntly, "Is the definition of education as planned change a worthy concept?" And his answer is negative. He argues that the Boyd-Apps model is "a potentially prescriptive, technicist tool for research and practice." The

philosophical pillar that supports the model is but one pillar of the foundation of adult education.

> We need a more accurate, many pillared representation of the foundation of adult education and serious discussion of the continuing challenges various philosophies offer one another. Educators should not view the debate over the choice of a model as merely an intramural skirmish in adult education. Our definitions of our field, our methodology, and our goals affect not only our activities but those of all individuals, groups, and communities who participate in any form of learning. Because adult education is an activity essential to the functioning of the democratic society, we cannot be content with a partial understanding of it (12).

Linguistic analyst, Israel Scheffler (13) distinguishes three types of definition: stipulative, descriptive and programmatic. Stipulative definitions of adult education are, in a sense, invented in that a term is used to mean what its author wants it to mean. Descriptive definitions represent a dictionary approach to terminology, where several definitions may apply from different contexts. The programmatic definition refers to positions and programs where certain norms, prescriptions and values exist--where adult education aims at a specific purpose, thought or way of being and doing things. It is in this sense that the Boyd-Apps model is a programmatic, or prescriptive, tool for research and practice.

Aside from the philosophical/political disagreements in the field about the meaning and purpose of adult education, another problem resides with the concept of "adult" and that of "adults." Most often professionals speak of "the adult as learner" which suggests study of the individual: how does she/he learn? Does he learn differently from she? Are there major differences cognitively? The adult as individual is perhaps most central to the field, especially as regards research into learning modes, participation, and characteristics. On the other side of the picture reside "adults"--groups, communities, society as a whole. While "adult" suggests psychological study, the use of the term "adults" pushes us over into a sociological mode. This differentiation is useful, for it's is a reminder of disciplinary distinctions in the field. Indeed, by thinking "adults" instead of "adult," the reality of large-scale planning and program development is made clearer. The utopian ideal of progress through a scientific, rational, problem-solving process gains feasibility.

A major perspective of adult education, then, is purely social; it sees the process of learning as "investment," as

"resource development." The adoption of this perspective and its advocacy can be traced by way of definitions used over time.

Malcolm S. Knowles and Chester Klevins in Materials and Methods in Continuing Education (1976) explore three methods of definition which have come into use since 1930: 1) definition by classification, 2) definition by structural analysis, and 3) definition by operational analysis (14). The Knowles-Klevins overview highlights the variety and complexity that come with trying to define adult education. The suggestion, however, with regard to the third definition is that adult learners have to be "producers"; this underscores the national-development approach to adult education as a social "tool" for economic productivity.

The field of adult education is as broad or as narrow as the definer wants it to be. Certain organizations, associations and programs tend to provide it leadership. Various and different institutions are associated with its services. Numerous and distinct clientele engage in it. And it involves distinctive educational goals and processes. Or, at least, that is the claim: it is a claim essentially for uniqueness.

But what is the uniqueness of adult education?

While the claim may be overstated with regard to processes, still it can be said that adult education distinguishes itself by its leadership within the field of education, by the types of institutions that serve adults--although those that serve youth are equally diverse albeit not in the same way, and by its clientele--their age, their interests, their goals, and by the goals of society with respect to adult education.

While the adult learner singular and learners plural may form the central core around which adult education operates, the goals of these adults, those of the institutions that serve them, and the goals of society with regard to adult education are all in play at the same time. Thus, various initiatives may be seen to exist among learners, government enterprises and public/private institutions. Broadly distinguished they are:

a) National development--policies at the Federal governmental, level;

b) Corporate industry/business development--private initiatives for worker orientation and technical training, including corporate programs for adult basic education;

c) Self development--"self-directed learning project (15) initiatives.

Utilizing the above conceptualization the following diagram conceives of adult education as focussed on (the) adult

learner(s), articulated by various institutions, programs and self-directed activities and determined by public, private and self-directed initiatives. The diagram recognizes the threefold directions within the field: 1) toward publicly sponsored, policy mandated adult learning services; 2) toward parallel "independent" programs for adult professional and personal study; and 3) the "self-directed" activities which have obtained throughout civilization as a means of adult learning. While acknowledging the vastness and significance of public and private (corporative) initiatives for adult and continuing education, the diagram gives recognition to the breadth and importance of self-directed learning initiatives.

The diagram shows the overlap between government policy and private-enterprise initiatives and suggests, by dotted lines that self-directed activity may take place within or as a result of various other educational activities or, of course, it may be free of public or private catalyst.

The diagram over-emphasizes the public interest in education for adults for the purposes of this paper. In broad outline Figure 1 conceives of the universe of adult education as a circle, or pie, with the top half covering policy-mandated education for adults, and the lower half extending over private-enterprise and self-directed initiatives. The proportioning of the diagram is not meant to be exact, but indicative of the territory covered by adult education.

Adult educational policy is another term that must be confronted for its true meaning and not left to vagaries. Education, even when concerned to develop critically reflective minds, is nevertheless directed, as noted by education philosopher Donna H. Kerr, toward "the development of some beliefs, understandings, attitudes, and dispositions" (20). And yet, adults are different from children and youth and adult educators like Cyril O. Houle think of the process of education as first of all something "by which men and women (alone, in groups, or in institutional settings) seek to improve themselves or their society by increasing their skill, knowledge, or sensitiveness; or it is any process by which individuals, groups or institutions try to help men and women to improve in their ways" (21).

The choice to learn, or not learn, isn't considered in the above definitions, although the question of choice remains a major principle which has become an issue that has led to not a little debate. Note specifically the creation of of NAVL, the National Association for Voluntary Learning, an advocate group in favor of voluntary participation as a principle in adult education and in opposition to mandatory adult education. The moment the term adult encompasses the dual definition cited by Cyril Houle, then the problems of learning and teaching become by extension those of policy, planning, program development and evaluation. Thus adult education is never just one thing, activity, group, process or system. Indeed, while an emerging system of adult education is currently being developed implicitly, and to some extent explicitly through policy, its directions are not yet clear.

Educational policy can be distinguished from other policy by virtue of its main concerns. Even when mandated by an educational institution, policy is not always related specifically to education. Thus educational policy is distinguished from other policy, say, policy regarding physical plant and grounds. Kerr, in Policy and Education has categorized educational policy into four basic areas of concern which are:

a) curricular policy
b) methodological policy
c) resource-allocation policy
d) distributional policy

Contents, methods, resources and distribution of education are the main policy concerns, according to Kerr. But other educational policy concerns exist, including educational funding and governmental control. Political issues are missing from Kerr's categorization.

Politics and governance are never not part of educational policy. Kerr's definition suffers by referring almost exclusively to education programs--in terms of curriculum, methods, resources and access. The role of the Federal government and that of the States is a highly significant consideration when thinking about education for adults (or any education for that matter). Certainly, the question of who will be ultimately responsible for adult education policy and programs and how we answer that question as citizens and professionals will make enormous differences. With respect to finances (resource-allocation), it appears that Proposition 13 in California, Proposition 1 1/2 in Massachusetts, and similar propositions in other states were essentially tax-cutting acts, but they were aimed at education, and especially adult education.

Perhaps it is enough to say that educational policy at the Federal and States levels is to be defined differently from educational policy at the local and institutional levels.

But while noting that educational policy (for adults) operates at different levels, it is also important to recognize that implicit policies operate in society. The existence of implicit policy is truly the base on which everything has been built, although one source suggests that only 58 percent of the policies established by government officials concur with public opinion (22).

Educational policy, then, refers to system as well as to program. It includes Kerr's category of concerns along with the dual perspective of adult education proposed by Houle. Inherent in any definition of educational policy is necessarily the fact that educational policy is policy for the education system (23)--whether as a whole or in part. It is this linkage to system that needs underlining since educational policy, not unlike educational planning and educational program evaluation, is often considered separately and yet the relationship among these interdependent processes is so circular and "symbiotic" (24, 25) that it bears repeating so that policy, planning, program development and evaluation are clarified as parts of educational policy which in turn is part of a whole larger process called social policy.

II. Public Policy Issues in Adult Education

While policy formation, advocacy and the process itself may appear to be integral if not fundamental to policy concerns, what is ultimately at stake is the question of values underlying policy, i.e. the issues themselves.

A public policy issue, as defined by analysts Coplin and O'Leary "is a disagreement between two or more elements of a society over the way that the society's government deals with a given condition" (26). In an article on technology assessment, one social scientist describes a public policy issue as:

> a fundamental enduring conflict among or between objectives, goals, customs, plans, activities, or stakeholders, which is not likely to be resolved completely in favor of any polar position in that conflict. The necessarily temporary resolution of issues by a public policy is likely over long periods of time to move closer to favoring one policy over another. Thus, the crucial question facing public policy in any given time is striking a fresh balance among conflicting forces (27).

To take the next step, to the operational and manipulative aspects of public affairs and the creation of philosophical systems, the differing conceptions of the desirability of public policies, and beliefs about the right kind of political structure and behavior, is to enter the realm of politics and political philosophy. This section notes that step but concentrates on the issues currently (and historically) contraversial in the field--among professionals and others concerned with adult education activities. The focus is on areas of disagreement, with a view to their classification.

An examination of major governmental and non-governmental advisory committee policy position statements about adult and continuing education (28), along with the preceding definitional analysis of adult education and educational policy, suggest that there are three principal classes of adult educational issues. These include issues on:

1) Purpose (and strategy),
2) Control (and funding), and
3) Program development (and analysis).

This classification includes not only the issues themselves, i.e. the disagreements over purpose, control and program development in adult education, but the means to resolving these issues which involves the policymaking process. Since engagement in policy debate and process entails human action, two elements are operative: the <u>end</u> being pursued and

the means used to reach it. A third element is the consequence of the action--to policy or not to policy--and finally the outcome of the whole process judged over some period of time.

The first two classes of issue proposed above deal with adult education as a social and governmental, political realm of concern while the third class of issue relates more nearly to the policy categories ennumerated earlier by Donna H. Kerr, specifically: curricular, methodological, program-resource allocation and program-access policies. The last two of Kerr's categories might be claimed as involving resources and distribution of adult education determined at the political rather than program level. Either interpretation is acceptable, for the purposes of this paper.

Purpose and Strategy

The purpose of adult education is more often determined by default, or by rally to seemingly value-ladenless propositions, such as, the purpose of adult education is to serve all adults but especially the disadvantaged. Indeed, only recently has the field faced the reality that its principles may be quite different, even opposed to the purposes attributed to adult education by contemporary social presures. While many espouse the collectivist school of thinking about adults as social units and resources, others continue to uphold the tenets of individualism and freedom of choice as absolutes.

To think systematically about purposes of adult education, certain distinctions require elaboration. In specific, the purposes of adult education can be distinguished as to levels, premises and strategies. The level of authority is usually indicative of the approach to purpose. In specific, the purposes of adult education at the national-international level can be distinguished because of the overwhelming emphasis on socio-economic, investment, technicist concerns from those purposes held at the professional level with its focus on self-direction and the assessment of individual, group and community needs. Moreover, both of these orientations can be further compared and contrasted with the working principles adopted by different practitioners.

The premises underlying adult education often go unanalyzed, although these premises are beginning to be recognized within the field. Elias and Merriam in their work on Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education (29) lay out the major perspectives of what adult education means and where and why professionals in the field differ. They delineate six thought systems, or philosophies: Liberal Adult Education, Progressive Adult Education, Behaviorist Adult Education, Humanistic Adult Education, Radical Adult Education and Analytical Adult Education. Useful and needed though this text may be, filling a long embarassing gap, a next step is to relate

these six thought systems with political philosophies, for it is there, I would argue, that the richest clues to professional disagreements lie. To what extent, for instance, is the profession's insistence on "organization" and "planning" moving the field toward collectivist approaches to society? Indeed, to what extent has the profession turned its back on questions of society to lesser questions of solving specific social problems?

Current philosophy of adult education is perhaps best perceived by examinating proposed strategies. Such examination unveils the blur within the profession about the meaning of these strategies--and with reason, for the strategies have been adopted pell-mell and en masse without analysis to date. I am referring to the strategy of Continuing Education as it has developed spontaneously in this country and the various other strategies which are in process of infiltrating from abroad, specifically from inter-governmental organizations--e.g. Recurrent Education, Lifelong Education, and what English-speakers are calling "Lifelong Learning." These strategies are not different ways of saying the same thing.

The three terms--lifelong, continuing and recurrent education--deserve precise definition. In another article (30) these terms are decoded at length. Briefly, continuing education refers to educational opportunity for adults who seek to further their education either within or beyond the public school system. The philosophical underpinning is that of "positivism." The term recurrent education eschews the so-called "front-end" model of education which concentrates education in the first period of people's lives, from birth up to the statutory school-leaving age. It adopts alternative models which seek to shorten the periods of early education and of retirement while distributing this time at intervals over the lifespan. Inherent in this approach is the question of entitlement to a certain number of years of free, or public, education. It claims to be more "humanist" (31). The vaguer but vaster term, lifelong education "views education in its totality and includes learning that occurs in the home, school, community and workplace, and through mass media and other situations and structures for acquiring and enhancing enlightenment" (32). Unlike the concepts of "continuing" and "recurrent" education, the intention of the lifelong education concept is to cover all aspects, levels, places and philosophies of adult education. But does it? While this paper seeks to distinguish rather than to choose or take sides specifically, it may be said that the lifelong education concept is very much in the tradition of collectivist thinking. The UNESCO lifelong education model purposes, I would argue, a rational utilization of "human resources" generally requiring central direction and organization according to a consciously constructed "blueprint".

Governmental and inter-governmental bodies tend to stress the role of adult education as a tool for economic (and "human

resource") development, and that perspective has also permeated the profession's thinking. Many accept this role almost offhandedly as though that were always and inevitably the purpose of adult education. Furthermore, until recently the role of government in adult education was not only left unquestionned but it was considered essential, perhaps because support for education to disadvantaged adults was hard to come by. Today, the fever for national, central control is no longer spreading, so fast, but it is still a major issue.

Control and Funding

Who controls, or should control, adult education? The issue has a professional as well as a political history. Its politics became most evident with the election of Ronald Reagan but was the culmination of years of tension between the Federal and state governments. In 1977, Ewald B. Nyquist, then commissioner of education and president of the University of the State of New York called for reconsideration of what he termed "the State-federal contract;" he wrote:

> I urge Congress and the President to review the federal role in education. This is not what the framers of our Constitution envisioned. This is not a truly federal system. States should be able to work together with the federal government in making necessary changes in existing legislation and regulations. All parties to the contract should have ample opportunity to participate in the formulation of, and agreement to, its stipulations (33).

Representatives from state agencies argue that education, including education for adults, is "a federal concern, a state responsibility, and a local operation" (34); and they speak for a partnership between federal and state governments. But then, what would consitute a partnership between the states and the federal government? Would it mean "direct" rather than "categorical" funding of programs? Certainly it has in part been interpreted this way by the Reagan administration. Would it serve to increase the "multiple planning processes" (35) at the state, as well as the federal, levels?

While educators of adults look towards federal government for funding, there is increasing concern with federal control. For instance, federal aid created a vast transformation in higher education, and although some, like President of the American Council of Education J. W. Peltasen, would argue that "The nation and the higher education enterprise have every reason for pride in what has been accomplished", others like Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan would maintain that federal assistance is a means toward manipulation of higher education and leads to "nationalizing the universities."

Fragmentation of federal education policy is nevertheless a major concern. Gladieux and Wolanin point up the issue in Congress and the Colleges (1976) but conclude that a comprehensive federal policy is not the answer. They note that, "because the federal role is supplementary to that of the states, an aspect of the consensus is that a comprehensive federal policy is unnecessary. Indeed, if such a comprehensive policy were formulated, it might violate the understanding of the proper federal and state roles because it would imply a primary federal responsibility" (3o).

The issue of federal/state partnership or state/federal partnership raises increasing concern about the implications of the federal relationship. As suggested by Nyquist in 1977, state policymakers and administrators want to see the state/federal contract reconsidered, with more power returned to the states. The major problems appear to be: fitting federal and state programs into coherent plans and effective linkage of federal and state funds. Thus, while opposing a comprehensive federal education policy and structure, few if any desire to do away with federal programs. On the contrary, in Federal Legislation and Education New York State, Commissioner Gordon M. Amback calls for closer ties with the federal government and, recognizing that unemployment and underemployment is an urgent issue in the 1980's recommends a "comprehensive and long-range Federal program to coordinate Federal, state and local priorities linking areas of education and employment" (37).

There appear to be at least two main lines of thinking about federal government intervention in educational domains: one that calls for partnership and another that proposes state hierarchy, harking back to original mandates and constitutional rights. Whatever the perceived liabilities of a larger federal role, however, hardly anyone seemed to be calling for the dismantlement of federal programs or halting growth in federal support, at least not until the Reagan administration came to power.

In between the outspoken advocates for federal comprehensive policy in adult education and those against, other analysts like Charles Lee, former Executive Director of the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, argue that the question of a comprehensive policy is not one of pro/con stances. Rather, a comprehensive federal policy already exists; it just hasn't been fully formalized (38). This position suggests that it is no longer a matter of deciding about comprehensiveness but rather about other, operational and cooperative, questions. What direction and goals does society want to see articulated by the federal government? What controls and responsibilities should the federal government take? What purposes should be served by education for adults at the national level and within the framework of national socio-economic development goals? What kind of coherent

planning process needs to be created between federal and state governments? How can federal government express its concerns for adult education without undermining state responsibility for education and lifelong learning?

Disagreement as to the extent of national (Federal) control of education, in general, is fierce. It embraces the entire issue of centralization versus decentralization of government. It is perhaps the political issue of adult education, although the ultimate question is not that of national versus state (nationwide) policy but whether or not public policy is even required, or desirable. Many think public policy is needed. In a recent lecture one spokesman argued as follows.

> We have a foreign policy...why not a national policy spelling out a long-range plan to wisely utilize our most precious resource...the human resource. Such a policy should spell out, in no uncertain terms, the place of the community, junior and technical colleges in this vital process. That policy should call for investment in worker assessments and training-investments that would have long-range benefits, as opposed to current bandaid approaches and it must recognize that people are not the problem, they are the answer to the economic dilemma (39).

Why not? Indeed, why not even a comprehensive public policy coherently administered between the Federal and State governments across the entire spectrum of adult education activities? Why not? Perhaps because it would institute a public adult education system, or a public education system in which adult education would be integrated and where mandatory education for adults became law. Why not? Perhaps because national development consists of much else besides economic growth. Sir Authur Lewis made this point in the opening pages of "The Theory of Economic Growth" in 1955, and the World Economic Survey for 1968 emphasized it once more. Nevertheless, the significance afforded economics as the main, or sole, factor in adult education is greater than ever. Evaluations show the strong emphasis given to cost statistics and economic considerations with respect to impact of education received by adults. This the case at all levels of adult education--in Adult Basic Education, Continuing and Extension Education, and in Higher Education for adults. The dollar-and-cents value of adult education is the number-one issue for government officials seeking accountability for their expenditures of public monies. The insistance on educational planning as an adjunct or subhead of general economic planning reduces education to economic purposes. This is a severe limitation on adult education, and on education in general, as the varied benefits of specific educational activities and programs are impossible to calculate in terms of dollars and cents. Not all economists agree that

education should be so limited. Chicago professors C. Arnold Anderson and Mary Jean Bowman stated in 1960:

> When the aims and operations of education are considered in their own right as a focus of planning, the aim can be as manifold and complex as the functions education is expected to perform. Manpower considerations become merely one aspect of educational planning with no necessary priority over other goals. The focus comes to be more on people, less on production of "human resources" (40).

As society increasingly reveres learning, including learning by adults, and as continuing education becomes a significant aspect of the lives of adults, the issue of mandatory education for adults grows even stronger. Continuing professional education is already generally accepted as compulsory today. Some talk of making Adult Basic Education mandatory for certain populations, especially new immigrants. "Human Resource Development" in the nation's industries and business has become implicitly mandatory. For a profession in which voluntary participation served as a basic principle until relatively recently, the issue is basic. Perhaps the profession will eventually narrow its concerns to certain aspects of adult education. One social critic suggests that "the liberal arts tradition could become the moral specialization of the growing adult education sector in American public educational efforts since such programs attract many individuals who have come to experience dissatisfaction in the market oriented world of work" (41).

A severe division also exists between adult educators espousing competency-based, vocational, occupational, and career-development education and those advocating adult education for critical, reflective agency aimed at understanding society and the self as primary, or preliminary, to all else. Is adult education inclusive, or do purposes exist which clearly distinguish between adult education and adult training, between education and adult socialization, between job skills and learning for self renewal and development? Or, are these false dichotomies, between "vocational" and "academic" orientations? Is there good reason why the American Society for Training and Development exists along with the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education? Is that reason because Human Resource Development (HRD), speaks to only one purpose of adult education?

It seems that questions of purpose and strategy cannot be separated from those of control and funding, although they fall into different categories. Ultimately the purposes and strategies associated with the field will determine the way in which it is controlled and funded. However, the issue of who controls, or should control, adult education has demanded

special attention in America where the related, larger issue of governmental centralization versus decentralization continues to spark debate.

Program Development and Analysis

Issues of adult program development and analysis are so intimately related to questions of the purpose and control of adult education that they too cannot truly be separated except for classification. As other authors point out (42, 43), a symbiotic relationship exists between educational planning and evaluation; and the present author has further underlined the relationship between policy and evaluation and, indeed, among all three processes of policy, program planning and evaluation (44).

Of the three sets of issues in this paper's classification, program development is also the most difficult to discuss in broad spectrum for the issues refer more specifically to institutional disagreements as to curricula, methods of program delivery, resources and distribution as well as to issues of competition and turfdom. While the latter may not be "educational policy" issues according to some, their absence from discussion would ignore the politics of adult and continuing education and thereby its policies regarding program development.

In continuing education, Berkeley University Continuing Education Director Milton Stern notes inter-institutional, internal, and external competition within the field. With respect to Adult Basic Education considerable in-fighting has developed as to which institutions should be responsible for teaching adults with less than high-school education. Should it be the elementary/secondary public school system, the community colleges, or both? What about the role of university continuing education programs, or other institutions such as technical institutes (as in North Carolina)? Does this issue deserve resolution through Federal policy? What will universities do now that "non-traditional" students have become a majority? Will this influx of adults result in the "democratization" of higher education? What is the role of universities today?

Developing and analyzing programs entails operational concerns for institutions as well as government. The issue of "systems analysis" is particularly germaine to any discussion of program development because of its gradual dominion in the field as the method for analyzing program operations and success. Systems analysis implies system, and system implies comparability, even formula. The methodology carries a message. For it defines adult education as a structure performing a certain function for society, which would seem reasonable until the question is asked as to what kind of structure is meant by the term "system". System, as interpreted by systems analysis

does not refer to the biological theory of system with its emphasis on interdependence but to engineering and the metaphor of mechanism where the various parts are not pervasively and continuously interdependent as in a biological system. The difference is crucial.*

Throughout this paper the concept, meaning and consequences of "system" keep returning as central to discussion. Indeed, the ultimate purpose (vision) of the field, its control and programmation, depends on conceptions and actions regarding system. Will system be determined by predetermined options or allowed to develop through evolutionary processes? That is the major question, and in a time of strong urges toward organization, planning, and "social engineering," the likelihood is that predetermined dictates will prevail. Systems analysis in its becoming the major methodology of program and policy analysis is indicative of the trend toward central planning and promulgation of the mechanical model of program development. It reflects the growth of large-scale, centralized programs and the policy strategies by governmental agencies toward system in the development of adult education. Is this trend and the strategies for system good or bad, inevitable or not? While the answers will never be final, the time for partisan responses is now.

SUMMARY

This paper reflects on policy issues in adult education. It underlines the bifurcation of the field, with its interests in learning and teaching qua learning and teaching and its commitment to adult education as a force for social and economic change.

The second part of the paper deals specifically with policy issues in education for adults and classifies them under three rubrics: purposes and strategies, control and funding, and program development and analysis. These three breakdowns are

---

*For detailed critques of systems analysis in public policy, see: Hoos, Ida R.; Systems Analysis in Public Policy: a Critique; Berkeley, Ca. L. University of California Press, 1972; and House, Peter W.; The Art of Public Policy Analysis; Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Library of Social Research vol. 135, 1982.

further related to philosophical differences in the field regarding equity versus efficiency, distinctions among major strategies for systems development in adult education, federal versus state authority for adult education policy and funding, the question of comprehensive policies in adult education at the national level, the purposes of adult education with respect to economics, and the limitations of systems anaylsis.

The position of this paper is that adult educators, as well as the public, must confront certain major issues regarding the purposes, control and program development of the field. Of course, issues are being faced daily but often without forethought, logic or consistency. Indeed, the argument of this paper is that adult educators must become partisan with regard to certain issues, not automatically partisan but thoughtfully responsive. As one leader in the field has put it, from his position: "There are strong voices arguing that no education can ever be neutral, that adult education must be partisan at least about the rights of the undereducated" (45).

What is (are) the purpose(s) of adult education? Who should wield primary responsibility for and control of its direction? Which programs appear to require policy development and support? What should be the values and methodologies for analyzing program success?

In the final analysis, this paper suggests that at the core of all adult education public policy issues is that of "system". Do adult educators, and the public, want to see a public education system established--whether in line with continuing, recurrent or lifelong education conceptions and practices? Or, should government involvement in adult education be limited to provision of opportunity for the undereducated and thereby for the advancement of equity in society?

If our strategy is to become part of a public policy mandated system, then what will be the consequences of the system we choose, or that is chosen? Or, would we prefer to allow "the system" to develop spontaneously as it has to date with special interests leading the way? The question of "system" concerns everybody but especially the profession. Moreover, the issue of system is yet to be fully understood, or appreciated (I would argue), for it is questionnable that all those who advocate a "lifelong learning" system realize as some do (46), that such a system may well mean the end of adult education as a unique profession.

To confront issues regarding public policy for adult education is a major step toward understanding the field, but even more so is that confrontation important for influencing the direction and development of adult education in the social context.

REFERENCES

1. Stewart, David W. "Politics is Not a Four-Letter Word," Continiuum, ILVI: 1, 1981, p. 63-66.

2. Whaples, Gene C. "Lobby is Not a Four-Letter Word: The Future of Adult Education Depends on Your Effectiveness," Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 5:8, April 1982, p. 4-5, 30.

3. Lasswell, Harold. Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. N. Y.: McGraw Hill, 1936.

4. Christoffel, Pamela H.; "Current Federal Programs for Lifelong Learning: A $14 Billion Effort;" In School Review, 86:3, 1978, p. 348-359.

5. Kingston, Robert J. "Creating the Learning Society in America," Continuing Higher Education, 28:1, 1980, p. 24.

6. Williams, S. Griffith and Howard Y. McClusky in Foreword to: Boyd, R. D., J. W. Apps, and Associates; Redefining the Discipline of Adult Education; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, p. ix.

7. UNESCO. Learning To Be. Paris: 1972.

8. Sheats, Paul. "Introduction," In R. S. Smith, G. F. Aker and J. R. Kidd (eds.), Handbook of Adult Education. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1970.

9. Carlson, Robert A. "The Boyd-Apps Model", in Boyd, R. D., J. W. Apps, and Associates; Redefining the Discipline of Adult Education; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, p. 174.

10. Ibid., p. 175.

11. Ibid., p. 175.

12. Ibid., p. 183-184.

13. Scheffler, Israel. The Language of Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1960.

14. Knowles, Malcolm S. and Chester Klevins, "History and Philosophy of Continuing Education;" in Klevins, Chester (ed.), Materials and Methods in Continuing Education; Los Angeles, Ca.: Klevins, 1976; p. 15-16.

15. Tough, Allen. The Adult's Learning Projects. Toronto, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.

16. Knowles, Malcolm S.. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. Chicago: Follett, 1980, p. 25.

17. Ibid., p. 25.

18. National Advisory Council of Adult Education. Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: 1980, p. 5.

19. Dorland, James R. "The Impact of Legislation on Adult Education." In Shaw, Nathan C. (ed.), Administration of Continuing Education (Chapter 6). Washington, D.C.: NAPCAE, 1969, p. 118-135.

20. Kerr, Donna H. Educational Policy: Analysis, Structure and Justification. New York: David McKay, 1976.

21. Houle, Cyril O. The Design of Education. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1972.

22. Pye, Thomas R. Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliff, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972, p. 269.

23. Green, Thomas F., et al. Predicting the Behavior of the Education System. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1980.

24. Spaulding, Seth; "Evaluation of Adult Nonformal Education Programs: An International Perspective;" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, New York; March 18-21, 1982.

25. Rivera, William M.; "International Strategies for the Development of Adult Education;" unpubl.

26. Coplin, William D. and Michael K. O'Leary (eds.), Basic Policy Studies Skills; Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y.: Policy Studies Associates, 1981; p. xi.

27. Cosces, Joseph F. "What is a Public Policy Issue?" Judgements and Decision in Public Policy Formulation, AAAS Selection Symposium, 1, 1978, p. 34.

28. Rivera, William M. "Federal Policy for Adult Education: A Review of Approaches and Positions;" Continuing Higher Education, Fall 1981, p. 22-27.

29. Elias, John L. and Sharon Merriam; Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education, Huntington, N. Y.: Robert E. Krieger, 1980; 212 p.

30. Op. cit., Rivera (ref. 25).

31. Boyle, Charles; "Reflections on Recurrent Education," in International Journal of Lifelong Education; 1:1, p. 5-18.

32. Dave, R. H. (ed.); Reflections on Lifelong Education and the School. UIE Monographs, Hamburg, Germany: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1975; p. 43.

33. Nyquist, Ewald B. "The State-Federal Contract" in Compact, Winter 1977, p. 12.

34. Kazanjian, Miriam. "Policy Developments and the Lobbying Process for the Education of Adults. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University School of Education, Colloquium, October 30, 1980. (Published in Whaples, G. C. and Rivera, W. M. (eds.), Issues in Education for Adults, College Park, MD, University of Maryland, Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, 1982).

35. McNeil, Donald R. "State Planning for Lifelong Learning," in Florida, State Department of Education, State Planning for Lifelong Learning: Improving Access to All Citizens. Tallahassee, Fla.: State Department of Education, 1977, p. 19-33.

36. Gladieux, Thomas E. and Wolanin, Thomas R.; Congress and the Colleges. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Health, 1976; p. 7.

37. Commisioner Gordon M. Ambach, in: New York, Federal Legislation and Education in New York State. Albany, N. Y.: State Education Department, February 1980.

38. Lee, Charles. "The Politics of Funding for Education of Adults." Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University School of Education, Colloquium, October, 1980.

39. Parnell, Dale. The Missing Link. Los Angeles, Ca.: University of Southern California Pullias Lecture, March 1982, p. 4, (unpubl.).

40. Anderson, C. Arnold and Mary Jean Bowman; "Theoretical Considerations in Educational Planning;" in Adams, Don (ed.), Educational Planning; Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Center for Development Education; 1964, p. 10.

41. Stanley, Manfred. The Technological Conscience: Survival and Dignity in an Age of Expertise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978; p. 212-213.

42. Op. cit., Spaulding (ref. 24).

43. Bhola, H. S.; Evaluating Functional Literacy; Amersham, Bucks, England: Hulton Educational Publications, 1979.

44. Op. cit., Rivera (ref. 25).

45. Roby Kidd speaking at the National Adult Education Conference, Detroit, Michigan, 1977, quoted in: Gross, Ron; "Toward a Learning Society: Adult Educators Engage a World of Challenge;" Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 1:5, January 1978, p. 22.

TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE POLICY FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADULTS

BY
William J. Hilton
Director, ECS Lifelong Learning Project
Education Commission of the States

I am frequently asked to explain to people what it is that we hope to accomplish as a result of the Education Commission of the States (ECS) Lifelong Learning Project. I invariably respond by relating the short-term planning objectives that have been developed by each pilot state, and then by attempting to show how, through the implementation of those objectives, we hope to demonstrate how state policymakers might undertake the task of defining and implementing public policies that favor the extension of adult learning opportunities. That's probably not the most complete answer that I should give, but that's usually enough to satisfy any questioner, and so I just leave it at that.

Today, I would like to take my answer beyond what this project might be able to accomplish in three years, and to speculate about what an acceptable, comprehensive policy for lifelong learning in the United States might look like, if it were in place today. I emphasize the word "today" in order to underscore my feeling that policies are, and must be, transient if they are to be responsive to our changing needs. Hence, I do not expect that the policy vision that I will share with you today is one that will, or should, remain in force for all time to come.

In presenting my vision, I am going to assume that we are starting at "ground zero" in developing a comprehensive policy for adult learning that meets our needs in today's complex society. Once I have presented that policy construct, it should be clear to you how far I think we have gone in the right direction, and how much farther we have yet to go. I will also question the popular presumption that a comprehensive policy in this area would, in fact, be desirable among all of those who are now advocating such a development.

Before undertaking this exercise, I need to diverge for a time to make certain that we are all defining certain basic terms in the same way, and have the same understanding of some special considerations with regard to each of those terms.

What Are Policies?

Within the political arena, a "policy" is a general guideline for government action. It is often mistakenly characterized as a decision made by government officials, on the handling of a particular public problem, but a true policy is

not merely a single decision. Rather, it is a guiding principle for the making of what might be a vast number of decisions, at all levels of the administration within which the policy was established, as well as among the public at large.

When, for example, a policy decision is made by the federal government which prohibits discrimination against handicapped persons, bureaucrats in every federal agency are expected to comply with that policy in their daily decision making. Hence, the Secretary of Transportation knows how to respond to a complaint that handicapped citizens are being discouraged fron riding on buses that were bought with federal funds; the Secretary of Labor knows how he must respond to public employment practices that clearly discriminate against the disabled; Congress funds programs that provide special support to handicapped job seekers and thousands of local schools, colleges, and agencies across the nation make millions of individual decisions about eliminating structural barriers, discarding biased admission procedures, and monitoring every aspect of their operations to insure compliance with this public policy.

Thus it can be seen that policies are designed to insure a consistent pattern of responses, over an appropriate period of time, and among a great number of people, to a particular public problem. To be meaningful, a policy must:

- Be a logical response to a legitimate problem;
- Be clearly communicated to everyone who is expected to comply with it;
- Emanate from those to whom the public has entrusted the responsibility for solving such a problem;
- Have the general support of the people whose cooperation will be necessary if it is to succeed in reducing or eliminating the problem; and
- Embody certain sanctions which can be invoked against those who otherwise would not voluntarily comply with the policy posture.

Several other characteristics of policies are worth noting here. A policy is what a policy does. Mere statements of policy are meaningless unless they are supported by actions. When we adopt a policy that clearly requires that spending of money, but then refuse to appropriate the needed funds, we have no policy--we have an empty promise.

Government inaction is also a form of public policy. Political leaders, the judiciary, and administrators of public services will frequently have legitimate cause not to take any action at all to relieve or eliminate a public problem, and this abstinence in that regard can be fairly described as a policy response.

While the public at large can and does often play a crucial role in the development of public policies, policymaking is most often done by government officials whose policy decisions do not necessarily concur with public opinion about how a problem should be handled. Thomas R. Dye, in his book Understanding Public Policy[1], cites one study which suggests that only 58% of the policies established by government officials concur with public opinion--only slightly better than a 50/50 pur change agreement!

It must also be noted that policy development occurs on several levels of government. During this century, Congress has not hesitated to leave a variety of policy options to be defined by the agencies charged with the administration of specific laws.

> Thus, the Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to fix "just and reasonable" railroad rates; the Federal Communications Commission, to license television broad-casters for the "public convenience and necessity;" the Forest Service, to follow a "multiple use" policy in the management of national forests that balances the interests of lumber companies, sportsmen, livestock grazers, and other users; and the Environmental Protection Agency, to insure that the "best practicable" devices for the control of water pollutants are in use...[2]

Aside from the license which might be given to an agency to create policy, agencies of both state and federal government frequently make their own policies anyway, or so administer a Congressional intent as to, in effect, significantly alter what Congress might have presumed would happen in the aftermath of its policymaking.

Another very important characteristic of policies is that they are value-laden. For example, an objective analysis of the food services being offered by a particular school system might lead one analyst to recommend that a free lunch program be instituted (because he views a high level of nutrition as a right which should be publicly financed for everyone), while another analyst, looking at the same issue, might argue for a public subsidy which reduces, rather than eliminates totally, the cost of a school lunch (on the grounds that people should be required to help themselves, an not depend wholly upon

---

1 Thomas R. Dye, Understanding Public Policy, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1972, Page 269.

2 James E. Anderson, Public Policy-Making, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1975.

government), while still another analyst might argue for a maintenance of the status quo (perhaps out of a feeling that at least minimal nutritional requirements are being met in even the poorest households, and that limited public resources might be better spent to improve the enployability of parents, who would then be better able to provide for their school-aged progeny). Most people would probably agree that there is something to be said for each of these value judgments, and it is that very fact that tends to immobilize us on an issue on which we need to take some action. (Recall, however, that agreeing to no action would still be a policy response).

It is in the resolution of conflicting value judgments that we enter the realm of policy decision making. The road to consensus can be very rough here, which is evidenced by the kind of furor surrounding such issues as publicly financed abortions, the ERA, conscription, and the proliferation of nuclear power plants across America. Whatever the issue, if policy decisions are ever to be made under our form of government, they will likely result in compromises which are not wholly satisfactory to any of the competing interests.

In a strictly semantical sense, a call for more "comprehensive policies" has a built-in redundance; it's a little like calling for "wet water". All true policies are intended to be comprehensive over the period in which they are in force, i.e., they are intended to take into account every contingency that relates to the eventual achievement of their goal. The call arises not from a lack of comprehensiveness under any one policy, though that may not be clearly understood by the ordinary citizen who finds himself being victimized in the resulting chaos, and who cries out for the relief that he presumes will come from more "comprehensive policies."

But there are those who would say that what he really wants is virtually impossible at this stage in the evolution of mankind. Policymakers are people who are engaged in an ongoing and volatile business. If they could somehow slam the brakes on this fast-paced world in which we live, and suspend all of the pandemonium that swirls about us in limbo for a few months, they might use that time to sit down and quietly compose a world order that most would agree is exactly what we want and need. Then, during the calm, they could simply restructure our laws and institutions, and recondition our thinking and expectations to conform to the new order before starting us up again.

But nothing short of magic on that scale, that I can see, is going to save us from conflicts in policy directions. To a very real degree, those conflicts are reflections of conflicts in the thinking of the American public. We don't all feel the same way about any particular issue, and how we might feel on an issue is likely to change over time, as our circumstances

change. They will be comprehensive, and well coordinated, in the same degree that we are.

One other point ought to be made about policies, and this may help you to understand the form my particular policy construct for lifelong learning in America will take. There is for each policy a sort of taxonomy which makes it possible to communicate about the essence of that policy in a manner that makes sense. There are three elements in that taxonomy: (1) A statement of the policy; (2) A set of guidelines that clarify what the statement means by way of generally defining for us how we are to carry out that policy; and (3) A set of procedures (actually programs and practices) by which means we actually implement the policy statement.

The first step is probably the easiest to take. The closer we get to the level of policy implementation, the greater will be the difficulty of reconciling value conflicts, and reducing tensions among those who perceive that their standing in the community, and even their very livelihoods, might be threatened by certain new policy alternatives. What we want here, essentially, is a group decision, and that is a lot harder to achieve than an individual decision, which is why a dictatorship is in many ways more efficient than a democracy. However, it must be remembered that just because all the geese in the flock might be easily persuaded to fly in formation, doesn't mean that they are going in the right direction. Through group decision making, we are more likely to discover that right direction before we take off into the wild blue yonder.

One example of a policy statement which results from a group decision might read as follows:

> Older Americans are a vital resource to the nation, and should have their contributions to society facilitated in both the public and private sectors.

The next element in the taxonomy, policy "guidelines," must derive directly from that statement. These guidelines bring us closer to the level of policy implementation, shed some light on the rationale behind the policy statement, and help to shape the characteristics of the implementation effort. Here are a few examples of guideline statements that might derive from, and further clarify the earlier policy statement:

1. Programs that enlist the talents of the elderly in volunteer service to the nation should be supported.
2. Funding should be provided to insure that the elderly will not be deterred from volunteer service because of any costs associated with rendering such services.

3. Appropriate education and training services should be provided to the elderly so that they will be better able to carry out volunteer services.

Based upon these guidelines, specific programs and practices are conceived and implemented at the community level, and it is at this level that individual citizens actually feel the effects of the policy development effort. For example, based upon my first guideline, public support might be provided for the establishment of local senior volunteer programs. Based upon the second and third guidelines, a block grant might be provided to the administrators of each of those local programs for use in covering the expenses of those volunteers who qualify, on the basis of need, to receive them: Transportation costs, phone bills, tuition stipends for related education and training purposes, and other expenses that would not otherwise be incurred by the volunteers were it not for their assignments.

In a comprehensive policy there is a clear and logical relationship between a specific program activity, the guidelines under which it was intended to operate, and the central premise, or "policy statment," from whence both guidelines and procedures derive.

Sometimes programs which are intended to implement particular policies seem to assume a life of their own, and stray out of line with those policies. And that's not necessarily bad. Human needs tend to change more quickly than policies, and often program implementers will try to be responsive to those changing needs. In doing so, they may look up one day and find that, instead of implementing one policy, they are creating a different and possibly conflicting policy. And there is no one standing by, with a huge eraser, to remove obsolete policies from the blackboard of life.

Thus it can be seen that, however comprehensive a policy might appear at a given time, eventually it may become less so.

A Comprehensive Policy for America

What would a comprehensive policy look like in America today?

In my view, such a policy would be predicated upon the assumption that there is no finite body of knowledge that one can acquire in the early years of life and that will be sufficient to sustain on throughout an entire lifetime. That was clearly not the popular presumption during the period when we were putting into place our current, youth-oriented system of formal education.

But a fundamental reality of today is that we are living in a time of constant and rapid change. Instead of having a single

career throughout their working lives, most adults today can expect to have as many as five careers. Half of the jobs that will exist ten years from now aren't even known today, so that we can expect to be continually developing new education and training opportunities.

Throughout the history of this country, the popularity of adult learning has waxed and waned, and we may again enter a period in which the degree of emphasis that we now place upon this concept may not be as necessary, but for now, both as individuals and as a society, we have a critical need to advance this concept. Hence, I would adopt as my starting point in this comprehensive policy construct a statement that reads as follows:

> Every American should be encouraged throughout his life to pursue further learning opportunities that contribute to his personal well-being, as well as the social and economic advancement of the nation as a whole.

Note that this statement casts the whole adult learning process into a rather practical mold. The further learning opportunities in which we are interested must "contribute" to personal or societal advancement. Not all learning does, and we need to recognize that forthrightly.

Here are some examples of policy guidelines that might stem from my policy statement:

1. Objective guidance information regarding available learning opportunities should be provided to every American.
2. No learner should be barred from further learning opportunities because of financial considerations.
3. Formal instructional programs should be characterized by quality, convenience, and high practical value.
4. Multigenerational programming should be emphasized wherever possible and appropriate.
5. Private investment in the support of educational programs and services should be maximized.
6. Formal learning activities should be predicated upon a "curriculum for life" that reflects a generally-agreed-upon set of learning objectives that should be met by every American, regardless of his or her age.

Neither my policy statement nor my policy guidelines draw any distinction between the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary delivery systems, because under a truly comprehensive policy all of these would be be restructured in an age-neutral way. In my world order, we would carefully define that which everyone, regardless of age, needs to know, and

include in that basic "curriculum for life" an emphasis upon the development of personal inquiry skills, so that each learner will be able to define and implement his personal learning programs as often as he will need to throughout his life.

In some ways, the basic content of this curriculum for life won't look vastly different from much of what we are already doing--everyone needs to be able to read, compute, and write. But the proposed curriculum would also place much more emphasis than we now do upon speaking and thinking. More emphasis would also be place upon self-understanding, as a critical pre-requisite to self-acceptance, and to understanding the group behavior of humankind, and these would all be required learning, as opposed to being "electives" on a roster of high school or college courses.

The way in which we implement this curriculum will be just as important as its contents. Implementation would be based upon a recognition of the importance of different learning styles, the developmental needs of learners who are in differing stages and circumstances in life, and the fact that all learners--not just adults, though they might bring the most--can bring some resources and information to the learning experience, and should be encouraged to do so as one means of insuring that they will have a depth of involvement in that process. (In my view, the notion that only adults are "experience rich" ignores the reality that some experiences contribute more to the learning process than others, and that some youth can be even better endowed in those areas than some adults.)

At the implementation level of my policy construct, one gets the clearest vision of what the adoption of such a comprehensive policy might mean. I see adults and youth grouped in the same types of learning experiences on the basis of their needs, rather than artificial distinctions based upon their ages. I see them cooperating with each other in the learning experience, without embarrassment, and to the advantage of everyone. I see learning facilitators (whom we now call "faculty") who are qualified to fill that role, not because of traditional credentials, but by reason of a personal love of learning, an ability to relate effectively and respectfully to all other learners, and an in-depth knowledge of learning resources and approaches.

I see adult learning being publicly advocated by leading officials and celebrities; a system of tax incentives and financial aid programs that encourages those forms of learning that will clearly benefit society as a whole; a wide range of providers, both public and private, who are engaged in the provision of quality learning opportunities; both credit and non-credit learning, occuring in a variety of settings, including individual homes, on park benches, and in a variety of community programs into locally planned and well-coordinated

provider organizations; and a growing reliance upon distance learning techniques (television, radio, audio-visual cassettes, etc.) to reach an ever-expanding audience of both youthful and adult learners. These aren't all of the changes that the new order would require, but they are as many as I can address here in a reasonable amount of time, and they do convey some sense of what a truly comprehensive policy for "cradle to grave" education might look like.

In Conclusion

Clearly, certain aspects of such a comprehensive policy will not be applauded by any who have a vested interest in the status quo. I suspect that many modern-day proponents of adult learning want only as much out of this business as will clearly benefit them. If adult learners can help bolster sagging enrollments, fine. But if a serious commitment to adult learning will necessitate such a major restructuring of our education delivery system--along client-centered lines--that current providers might be put at a disadvantage, many will vigorously oppose such a comprehensive policy.

We need to consider the possibility that the latter reality, as much as any other, might be a major deterrent to the development of a truly comprehensive policy for adult learners in this country. We also need to explore the means by which we might overcome any selfishly-motivated opposition to a comprehensive policy, regardless of its source.

Whatever the future might bring, the ECS Lifelong Learning Project is busy today testing the processes by which state leaders might eventually elect to implement comprehensive policies. We hope to provide America with the proper tools for getting the job done, as well as some concrete examples of how those tools might be used in the planning and policy development process. Whether or not we, as a nation, elect to make use of those tools for that purpose remains to be determined by the people whose interest they were designed to serve.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND THE LOBBYING PROCESS FOR EDUCATION OF ADULTS

BY
Kiriam A. Kazanjian
Federal Relations Representative
New York State Education Department

Even though technically I am not a lobbyist, the image of the "lobbyist" in Washington is a general one not without mixed views. It brings to mind a story about three Washingtonians at a cocktail party: an Administrator, a Congressman, and a Lobbyist who are debating the question of whose profession came first. The Administrator maintained that his profession came first because when God handed down the Ten Commandments to Moses on Mt. Sinai, Moses was required to interpret the Commandments and implement them according to God's will. The Congressman maintained that his job was the first profession because, indeed, the Bible says that in the very beginning, God created order out of chaos, and his job as a lawmaker is to create some semblance of order out of chaos. The Lobbyist stared at the two, sipped his drink, wryly smiled and said, "That may all be well and true, but how do you think created the chaos in the place!"

I would like to help vindicate this view of a lobbyist by providing an overview of the relationship between Federal policy development in education and the "lobbying" process from a state agency perspective. I will first expand my role and the reasons for establishing a New York State Education Department Washington office. In this context, I will outline the Federal role in education and the ideal relationship among Federal, state, and local education agencies. I will then discuss the necessity for lobbying, who lobbies, and the various processes we must work with at the Federal level. I will address the importance and impact of the lobbying process on the development of policy, highlighting some examples in the education of adults. In conclusion, I will underline some recent problems which are compounding the complexity of policy development in education at the Federal level.

I. Establishment and Function of Washington Office

In 1969, Commissioner Ewald B. Nyquist of the New York State Education Department saw the need for increased state involvement in the continuing development of the Federal role in education. Given our belief that education is primarily a state responsibility and a local operational function, the State Education Department maintained that the increasing Federal involvement in education needed to be monitored and guided in the direction it was taking. At that time, Commissioner Nyquist established an Office for Federal Legislation in Albany to begin this task. Later in 1972, as an expansion of this effort, I was

asked to open a Washington office for the Department. California and New York were the first states to almost simultaneously open such Washington offices. Since that time, the number of state education agency offices or representatives in Washington from various states has grown to about eight, including Califronia, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Washington. Virtually every State education agency now has this task assigned to at least one professional.

Not all state education agencies have the wide purview of responsibilities that we have in New York. The Board of Regents is a comprehensive governing board for all of education in the state, from early childhood education through the professions, public and private, including libraries, museums, science service, and historical societies. The official designation is really the University of the State of New York, which is based on the French concept of "university" as encompassing all life experience as education. The Commissioner of Education is also known as the President of the University of the State of New York. The State Education Department is the administrative arm of the Board, with responsibility for implementing its policy. Hence, my role in Washington is to represent the Board and commissioner in all areas under their jurisdiction.

As part of the Office of the commissioner of Education, my office functions as a liaison, providing information and recommendations to both Washington and Albany officials. At the end of each year, we present to the Board of Regents a proposed policy agenda for Federal education issues. Upon the Board's official adoption of the recommendations as the Board's policy in the early Spring, the Board of Regents and the Commissioner of Education meet with members of the New York Congressional Delegation to formally present the policy considerations for that year. It is then my job to work within the purview of this policy to analyze proposed Federal legislation and inform our Members of what is specifically favorable or unfavorable for New York State in the legislation; and if certain provisions are unfavorable, I am usually asked to suggest alternatives. I also work in a similar way with Federal agencies in the areas of policy development, regulations, and budget. I work with national organizations, other state and local governments representing education in Washington, collaborating whenever possible on mutual interests.

On the other side of the coin, it is my responsibility to provide the information necessary for the Board of Regents, Commissioner of Education, and various officials within the Department to be informed of ongoing and expected future developments in Federal education policy. Such information assists state officials in policy formulation, program, and planning activities.

II. Federal Involvement in Education

It has been documented that the Federal involvement in education has been over time a response to crisis situations. For example, in 1956 the launch of Sputnik brought about the fear that perhaps we were behind the Soviet Union in our science education. The response was enactment of the National Defense Education Act program. The Nation's civil rights problems contributed to the development of the Great Society programs of the 1960's, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. At present, the Federal role in education is being questioned and debated. Factors which seem to be shaping Federal education policy in the next decade include economic and demographic trends, such as declining enrollments, the maturing of the population, high teenage unemployment, inflation, and the Federal budget crisis. All of these factors are contributing to the discussion of a comprehensive policy for strengthening the economy, which encompasses a number of areas, including education and training. The Vocational Education Act, which is due for renewal and extension, and the proposed Job Training Partnership Act would fit into such a comprehensive policy in serving the perceived need to better link the worlds of work, education, and training (including retraining).

The Federal role in education over the years has been perceived as one of serving special needs, of supplementing and providing incentives for state and local funding for education. The Board of Regents and the State Education Department have embraced this concept for quite some time. Their view has been that education is a Federal concern, a state responsibility, and a local operation. A number of Supreme Court decisions over the years support this view of a limited Federal role.

Going back to 1941, the Supreme Court, in United States vs. Darby, stated what has become the guideline for the Tenth Amendment: "the Amendment states but a 'truism' that all is retained (by the states and the people) which has not been surrendered." There are those who maintain that education is one such function which is reserved to the states. In Brown vs. Board of Education (1954), the Supreme Court stated that "Education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments." In 1972, the Court recognized that "providing public schools ranks at the very apex of the function of a state." (Wisconsin vs. Yoder. Even in the controversial school finance decision of 1973, San Antonio vs. Rodriguez, the Court held that "though education is one of the most important services performed by the state, it is not within the limited category of right recognized by this court as guaranteed by the constitution.' Education may not be a right guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, but the provision of a free public education for all citizens is a state constitutional priority.

Then one might ask, what is the authority for Federal involvement in education? There are U.S. Constitutional authorities by which the Federal government can justify its involvement: one is in Article I, Section 8, the Spending Power (providing for the "general welfare of the United States"); the other is the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By the former authority, it has been established that Congress may set conditions upon which money and goods are distributed. In Oklahoma vs. Civil Service Commission (1974), the Supreme Court stated that the Federal government may "fix the terms on which Federal funds...shall be dispersed." Even earlier a California Superior Court put it another way in Ming vs. Horgan (1958); "When one dips ones hands into the Federal treasury, a little democracy clings to whatever is withdrawn."

States and localities are not required to accept Federal assistance or Federal funds. If they do so voluntarily, they enter into a contractual relationship and accept the conditions upon which the assistance is offered. For example, the state of New Mexico refused to accept funds under Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, because it could not meet the requirements stipulated in the law. In July 1974, the U.S. District Court of new Jersey found with respect to Federal education programs that "research . . . indicates that all the programs are voluntary on the part of the state of New Jersey, any may be terminated at will by the state." (New Jersey School Board vs. Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey).

There are limits to this reasoning: if we assume Congress has the authority to provide for educational programs, certainly this authority should not be construed as an unlimited, prescriptive license. In a 1976 decision, National League of Cities vs. Usery, the Supreme Court addressed this issue. The Court said it had "repeatedly recognized that there are attributes of sovereignty attaching to every state government that may not be impaired by Congress, not because Congress may lack an affirmative grant of legislative authority to reach the matter, but because the Constitution prohibits it from exercising the authority in that manner."

At stake here is the question of whether "attributes of state sovereignty" are being impaired by increasing Federal prescription affecting the states' provision of a free public education. National League of Cities referred to activities "typical of those performed by state and local governments in discharging their dual functions of administering the public law and furnishing public services. Indeed, it is functions such as these that governments are created to provide, services such as that that states have traditionally afforded their citizens."

The Supreme Court warned, "If Congress may withdraw from the states the authority to make those . . . decisions upon which their systems for performance of these functions must rest, we think there would be little left of the states' 'separable and independent existence.'" The Court stated decisively that "Congress may not exercise that power so as to force directly upon the states its choices as to how essential decisions regarding the conduct of integral governmental functions are to be made." Then the Court concluded that "such assertions of power, if unchecked, would indeed. . . allow 'the national government (to) devour the essentials of state sovereignty.'"

Even Congress has placed upon itself limitations on the Federal role in education. In 1970, Congress passed an amendment to the General Education Provision Act to include a prohibition against Federal control of education. That amendment prohibited the Federal government from exercising any "direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school or school system." It was this kind of concern over potential Federal control of education that prompted the great debate over the establishment of a separate U.S. Department of Education with Cabinet-level status. The creation of the Department was feared by some to be commensurate with creating a national school board, eventually usurping all control from state and local education agencies.

In order to allay such fears and achieve passage of the legislation necessary for establishing the Department, the Congress included another, much stronger prohibition of federal control provision. The statute reads, "It is the intention of the Congress in the establishment of the Department to protect the rights of state and local governments and public and private educational institutions in the areas of educational policies and administration of programs and to strengthen and improve the control of such governments and institutions over their own educational programs and policies. The establishment of the Department of Education shall not increase the authority of the Federal government over education or diminish the responsibility for education which is reserved to the states and the local school systems and other instrumentalities of the states."

To help insure implementation of such language, Congress also created in the Department of Education Organization Act, a Federal Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education. Membership in the Council must be widely representative of state and local, public and private agencies. Its task is to "provide assistance and make recommendations to the Secretary (of Education) and the President concerning intergovernmental policies and relations relating to education."

We have seen thus far the legal and constitutional constraints on a Federal role in education which act to define the extent of the Federal government's involvement. Any Federal education legislation must be carefully drafted to balance off these legal considerations.

This brings us to the question of what, from a public policy standpoint, is the overriding justification for a Federal role in education? The twin notions most frequently cited in this regard are "equity" and "access." When combined, these concepts have provided justification for a Federal role in assisting states, localities, and institutions in a supplemental way. The term "equity" in the provision of educational services is directed toward those special, identified population groups whose extraordinary needs require remedial or other extra services, often beyond the resource ability of state and local governments and instituions to provide in full. The Federal government has provided "categorical" programs, with the intention of assisting states, localities, and institutions in meeting the special needs of identified groups, such as the economically and educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped, and non-English speaking persons. The Federal funds are viewed as "supplemental" in nature, and statutorily are not allowed to supplant state and local funds. The notion of "access" fits into the concept of a free public elementary and secondary education provided by state constitutions. The intent of Federal assistance is to help in the provision of "access" for such groups to, what for their special needs, would constitute an "equitable" educational opportunity. Examples of such Federal programs include the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and the Adult Education Act.

In the postsecondary education area, the provision of free public postsecondary education is not generally a state constitutional right. Provision of "access" in this context is insuring that a student has access to the postsecondary educational institution of choice. The Federal government seeks to balance the economic inequities which exist for lower and middle income studnets who desire to attend colleges of their choice, but who otherwise would be prohibited due to high tuition and attendance costs. Such programs as Pell Grants (formerly known as Basic Educational Opportunity Grants), Supplemental Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study, and low-interest student loans are designed to meet this public policy objective.

Federal involvement in education has also been justified over the years where excessive burdens on education agencies and institutions are created as a result of direct Federal policy or actions in other areas. An example is the installation of a Federal military base or a public housing project which reduces a school district's tax base while increases the number of

children to be served. The response has been the controversial Impact Aid program. The recent influx of large numbers of Indochinese, Cuban, and Haitian refugees in selected states is another example of Federal policy creating excessive and immediate burdens on local school districts, prompting temporary Federal assistance in this regard.

It has been argued that despite the virtues of such policy objectives, the reality is that many Federal education programs have been structured with requirements and regulations which have exceeded the proper Federal role and intruded upon state and local authority. Further, the administrative burdens and legal mandates imposed by the Federal government, it is contended, are not balanced by a commensurate amount of Federal assistance needed to meet these requirements.

In many instances there is some validity to this problem. However, I do not believe it was Congress' intent to overburden as much as it may have been a result of simple overzealousness on the part of both the Congress and special interest groups seeking to insure that both equity and access are achieved. At the same time, however, these issues should not be allowed to overshadow the overwhelming success of the majority of Federal education programs over the years.

Representatives of different interest groups and governmental units, whether or not based in Washington, do indeed influence the character of Federal programs. In order to understand how this occurs, one must first learn about the structure of legislative and executive activities at the Federal level and how the "lobbying" process can influence such activities.

III. The Lobbying Process

We have seen the need to balance off defined Federal education policy objectives with legal and Constitutional constraints. Such a need demands a constant watch over Federal activities in education by the various groups and governmental units concerned. In addition, the governance systems and problems in education in the United States are varied and complex. There exists in Washington, therefore, a myriad of educational interests covering all aspects of the vast industry of education imaginable. Virtually every point of view is represented.

For example, states have a unique problem in representing their education interests in Washington, in that each state has a different education governing structure. New York State is fortunate to have a comprehensive state governing board, covering all of education. However, in many states, separate governing boards exist for elementary and secondary education, vocational education, postsecondary education; and sometimes

within postsecondary education there is separation in governance boards between two-year and four-year colleges. In addition, the immediate education needs and priorities may vary by state. Florida may face a crisis in its school system due to the unforeseen influx of Cuban and Haitian entrants. The problem in Texas might be serving illegal aliens, while some other states might have a particular concern in the area of postsecondary education or youth unemployment. Each state and locality is the best judge of what its particular needs are at the moment, and what the best mechanism is to serve these needs.

Such a complex education system adds to the difficulty a Senator or Representative must face in balancing off sound national public policy, legal constraints, and the needs of her/his particular district or state, not only in education in all areas. Lobbying can be an educational process in this regard, assisting Members in sorting out the complexity of it all.

The extent to which political considerations come into play in the lobbying process varies by each interest group. My function, for example, is not a political one. The Board of Regents is a fourth arm of state government, deliberately separate from partisan politics. I must work with all members of the New York Congressional Delegation, regardless of party affiliation, looking after and providing information on what is best for education New York State. However, other interest groups may take a decidedly more partisan tact, and this too has an influence on policy outcomes.

In order to understand the lobbying process, one must have a clear picture of the legislative and executive processes in Washington. I will explain each one in a general, over-simplified way for the purpose of discussion.

The legislative process is essentially structured by committees. There are three basic functions: authorization, budget, and appropriations. There is one budget committee, one appropriations committee, and several authorization committees in both the House and the Senate.

I would like to concentrate on the program authorization process. Authorization committees create Federal programs: they provide the "authority" for the appropriations committees to provide funding and the administrative agencies to implement a program. The authorizing statute sets up the content and structure of a program, and identifies the population to be served. It also defines the outer limits on funding.

While the program jurisdiction assignments to authorizing committees differ in House and Senate, one major committee in each house handles most education legislation. In the House, it is the Education and Labor Committee, containing three education

subcommittees: elementary, secondary, and vocational education; select education (handling handicapped, school libraries, and education research); and postsecondary education. In the Senate, it is the Labor and Human Resources Committee, containing subcommittees on education and on the handicapped. Although child nutrition programs are handled by the Education and Labor Committee in the House, they fall within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee in the Senate. Health professions is handled by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House. Such inconsistencies keep a lobbyist busy keeping track of where things are at any point in time.

When a bill is introduced in Congress, it is referred to the authorizing committee with jurisdiction and then to the pertinent subcommittee. Hearings are held, at which time interest groups may present their views for the public record. The subcommittee then "mark up" the legislation, making decisions on bill language, line by line. As a lobbyist, one must be vigilant and precise in analyzing the bill language as it is being marked up. A change in a comma or in the wording of a phrase can mean a change in intent or meaning. The bill is "reported" to full committee and another mark-up session occurs allowing Members not on the subcommittee an opportunity for input.

Both of these "mark-up" stages in House and Senate are critical times for most groups to insure language favorable to their cause. Once the bill is reported from full committee it is difficult to successfully amend the language on the House and Senate floors. In the House, the bill is first referred to the Rules Committee, which will determine if and what kind of amendments will be allowable on the House floor.

After House and Senate floor passage, a Conference Committee, consisting of Members from each of the pertinent House and Senate authorizing committees, is convened to iron out differences and write a compromise bill. Changes at this stage are only allowable within the parameters set by the House and Senate bills. For example, if one house sets an authorization level for a program of $30 million, and the other $50 million, the compromise can fall only between $30 and $50 million, all inclusive. After conference agreement, the "conference report" is sent to the House and Senate floors for passage. No further amendments are allowable at this time. After final passage and required processing, the enacted bill is sent to the President for signature, veto, or pocket veto.

The House and Senate processes on the same or similar bills do not always occur simultaneously. The job of a lobbyist with concerns over a number of areas becomes tedious when the House and Senate are acting on a number of different bills, in different authorizing committees, at the same time action is

being taken on the budget and appropriations. In addition one must remain aware of the policy and political positions the Administration, as well as one's colleagues from other interest groups, are taking. Coordination, patience, and persistence are talents one must learn in early training.

After a bill is signed into law, it is the ultimate responsibility of the executive branch for implementation. The executive process basically involves three main actors: the administrative agency (in this case, the Education Department), the Office of Management and Budget, and the White House.

The administrative agency has the responsibility in conjunction with the OMB, for developing overall policy, program, and budgetary plans for the implementation of Federal programs. For example, the agency must write regulations for program implementation within the scope of the statutory language and whatever Congressional intent has been expressed in House and Senate respective committee report language. The Congress and the public have opportunity for some input before regulations are promulgated in final form. This is critical since the content of regulations often do have policy implications. The agency is also frequently asked to recommend legislative proposals for the development of new programs, and/or elimination or modification of existing programs. All of the agency's work must be done in accordance with the President's policies, and in recent years must be approved by the Office of Management and Budget. The White House has the final approval authority an all major policy (including legislative) and budgetary proposals. In general, the Executive process has differed from Administration to Administration in structure in decision making authority, and in the opportunity for public input.

The lobbying process at the Federal level is therefore a complex one in the context of both the various processes one seeks to influence in Congress, in the Executive Branch, and the large numbers of states, localities, and interest groups seeking to influence. Important actions are taken, not necessarily in a sequential or orderly fashion, but sometimes simultaneously and unexpectedly. Any special interest group must lay the groundwork early with all parties involved, and be ready to act and react quickly to sudden shifts in positions and other surprises. In order to be effective, therefore, lobbyists must understand and know how to work this process inside and out.

IV. Impact of Lobbying Process on Policy Development

There is no doubt that "lobbyists" do influence policy outcomes at the Federal level. Despite generic differences among lobbying groups both public and private, there are at least three common functions carried out to influence policy outcomes: 1) supplying facts and figures on the need for

and/or impact of policy alternatives; 2) sifting out and utilizing political considerations, and 3) serving as a focal point for communication among all parties involved. Any one function can be carried out effectively only if a sense of trust has been built between the lobbyist and the party to be influenced. I will summarize each function briefly giving, where possible, some examples in the development of policy for the education of adults.

Given the wide range of issues on which a Senator or Representative must be expert, it is no wonder that someone who can provide accurate facts and figures on a timely basis in any one issue area becomes a treasured resource. We have seen that Federal education policy has endured over the years as a response to crisis, or serious problematic situations. The problem must be well defined and the needs specifically identified to justify the authorization of a Federal program. Interest groups can help Congress in this regard by supplying statistics, research results, and other expertise about the identified problem. One state or local school district, or postsecondary institution already may have made successful advancements in a particular area which could be used as a model for Federal program. As legislative language is proposed, a lobbyist must also be able to analyze and assess the impact on the particular area of interest.

For example, statistics show that our national population is aging; that postsecondary institutions will be experiencing drastic declines in enrollments; and that various technological, economic, and sociological factors are influencing adults to return to school for additional training or retraining. Facts and figures on these trends, along with the identification of social and economic barriers to a return for minority and low income adults have convinced many Members of Congress of the need for an increased Federal effort in the area of adult learning. During Congressional consideration of the Education Amendments of 1980 (the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act), a lobbying coalition was formed of public and private interests concerned about opportunities for adult learning. As a result of these coordinated efforts, several changes were made to existing Federal student assistance programs to assist low and moderate income independent students in returning to school. Some examples include the expansion of eligibility for state student incentive grants and supplemental educational opportunity grants to less than half-time students. This will assist the independent student in the determination of need and ultimately the level of Pell Grant awarded. Previously, the rate applied to independent students was lower, thereby placing such students at a disadvantage. Also in the Pell Grant program the maintenance allowance for commuter students was increased, and child care expenses were added to the factors used in the determination of cost of attendance. Finally, the Education Outreach Program was also enacted, consolidating a number of

existing programs to more clearly identify and expand opportunities for adult postsecondary learning, education information, and comprehensive state-wide planning in postsecondary education.

The second function I mentioned is sifting out and utilizing political considerations. There is no doubt that politics play an important role in the determination of final policy outcomes. Politics can mean the usual partisan style conflict and/or "committee" politics. The former is familiar to all of us: there are basic philosophical and ideological differences between Republicans and Democrats. These differences often emerge in the position a Member of Congress may take on a particular proposal. The party's platform is sometimes used to influence a Member's vote, usually when it reflects the position of the President (of the same party). A Member's own campaign platform and the views of her/his constituency are most important influences in the long run. When lobbyists seek to win a Member to their side, they must analyze these political considerations and capitalize on them when they are in their favor. Often some interest groups who have contributed funds or delivered votes in an election campaign will expect a return for such favors on key Congressional votes.

A kind of "committee" politics also exists, with an influence on policy outcomes. Each authorizing committee has a Chairman who is a member of the majority party in that house, and a Ranking Minority Member, a member of the minority party. There is also a second ranking majority member who often fills in for the Chairman in his absence. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member play influential roles in policy outcomes, crafting compromises to fit their particular political and constituent interests, and using their positions of seniority.

A recent example of how influential political factors can be is the "Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981." The landslide victory of President Reagan in November of 1980 and the continued popularity of his Republican platform policy to balance the Federal budget had a snowball effect in the summer of 1981. Congress (and the President) took advantage of a relatively new Congressional budgetary process call "reconciliation" to combine into one bill both budgetary reductions and authorizing changes, by-passing established legislative procedures (including the authorizing committee process). Major changes to education legislation were adopted swiftly on the House floor, with no opportunity for public hearings or public participation in the substantive changes made. Interest group lobbyists had little impact on the final policy outcomes. The political pressure to support the President's budget reduction were so intense that many House Members openly admitted they did not know the meaning and full impact of the 340 pages of substantial changes for which they

were voting. One fallout effect of this political warfare concerned adult education: a zeroing out of the funding authorization for the new Education Outreach Program. The practical effect was termination of the program.

The third function lobbyists carry out to influence policy outcomes is serving as a focal point for communication among all parties involved in an issue. For example, I have often found that the staff to Members on a committee do not communicate frequently enough. When New York had as many as four Members on the House Education and Labor Committee during the reauthorization of ESEA several years ago, I would often arrange on a regular basis for the staff to meet with my counterpart from the New York city Board of Education, a representative from the New York Governor's office, and myself to discuss coordination on an overall position favorable to New York State. These meetings allowed for a sharing of information among all parties involved, and got the staff working together for a common "New York" cause. Sharing information with staff on actions of the other house also enabled the Members to make strategic decisions aimed at a conference committee position favorable for later bargaining.

Such communication can be taken to a broader level, mobilizing all the national interest groups into a coalition on a certain issue. This was done on adult learning during consideration of the Education Amendments of 1980 mentioned earlier. Building such issue coalitions can facilitate passage of a piece of legislation in that everybody is "on board." In this way, dissent is minimized, and unforeseen obstacles can be removed swiftly. Telephone "trees" are often created for quick mobilization of forces when immediate action is required.

Some interest groups, such as the higher education associations, and the elementary and secondary groups meet on a regular basis to share information on legislative and regulatory actions taken or likely to happen in many areas of mutual concern. In this connection, I am tempted to mention the coordinative work of the Committee for Education Funding (formerly the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs)--the only umbrella organization at the national level that encompasses elementary, secondary, higher and adult education--except that its responsibilities are tied to issues relating to budget and appropriations committees and my discussion here pertains only to authorization committees. As the staff in Congress increases in number, and as the legislative process becomes more complex with the addition of the new budgetary procedures, such information sharing has become almost a necessity for survival.

V. Conclusion

I would like to conclude by identifying at least two recent problems we have been facing in the process, which will make Federal policy development even more difficult in the immediate future. The first involves the never ending process of balancing off the need and priorities of many different interests. In an ideal world with unlimited resources this is not a difficult task. However, in the context of scarce resources becoming more scarce, prioritizing in a political environment often takes it toll on good programs. For example, you have a pie divided in six pieces for six people. If a seventh person enters the room, there must be a redivision of the pie, or someone must forfeit a piece. We are now experiencing this dilemma in education with a Federal budget becoming tighter every year. As our national economic dilemma persists and pressures mount to reduce the size of the Federal pie, our future choices may become increasingly difficult. New initiatives will be delayed and/or existing programs will be reduced or eliminated.

A related problem is the new Congressional budget process. The process was formulated in 1974 under the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, to bring some Congressional control over the Federal budget. The House and Senate budget committees are still viewed by some as "new kids on the block." As the nuts and bolts of the process are still being modeled, committee jurisdiction fights are occuring which have an impact on policy. The budget committees are writing authorizing language into budget bills, authorizing language traditionally being under the jurisdiction of the authorization committees. The budget committees are also taking actions which impinge upon the jurisdication of the appropriations committees. Authorization and appropriations committees are retaliating in like manner, each trying to protect its "turf." The fights are creating a paralysis in the system.

A friend of mine often cites an old African proverb which is appropriate in this case: "when the giant elephants fight, it is the ants who get trampled." In other words, when power struggles occur, programs suffer. One example occurred in the Fall of 1980 when the conference report to the Education Amendments of 1980 was unexpectedly defeated on the Senate floor by one vote. A defeat of a conference report in education in either House or Senate is a rare occurence. The reason for this defeat was a committee jurisdiction fight between the Senate Budget and Labor and Human Resources Committees over authorizing language and cost issues. The controversy postponed passage of the conference report, causing delays in some programs for which the new fiscal year had already begun.

Another illustration is the example I cited earlier concerning the "reconciliation" process. This procedure was also created under the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, and when used for the first time in the summer of 1981, allowed for legislative changes without input from those persons and groups to be affected by the changes. Many programs, agencies, institutions, children, and adults suffered a loss of services as a result. This is a serious departure from what has been a truly democratic process in Congress and should not be repeated.

We will be witnessing in the near future not only changes in policy direction, but also in the structure and process by which Federal policy is developed. These changes merely enhance the need for lobbyists to monitor, sift, analyze and interpret Federal activities, and ultimately influence outcomes.

THE QUEST FOR A FULLY HUMAN POLICY FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADULTS

BY
Warren L. Ziegler
President, The Futures-Invention Associates of Denver, Colorado
(and Adjunct Associate Professor of Education at Syracuse University)

Introduction

The focus of this essay--the notion of the fully human applied to adult education policy--stems from another essay, "The Disciplines of Fully Human Policy."[1] In that earlier piece, we advanced the argument that fully human policy in all matters was worth aiming at despite a general disagreement over the meanings of the concept of the fully human. Confusion about the idea, we held, could be penetrated, if not transcended, by the acquistion and application of a set of disciplines--at present, six in number--which are accessible to everyone by virtue of their being persons.

The six are the disciplines of feeling, of imagining, of learning, of critical reasoning, of listening (which is the research discipline) and of wisdom (i.e., the ethics of consequentiality, sometimes referred to as a "futures" discipline). We shall not summarize that matieral here. Its main meanings will emerge in this essay, in which we apply the notion to the task at hand.

Is this search a reasonable enterprise?

To be reasonable means that we can give reasons for doing this, reasons which commend themselves to persons who are concerned about the directions humankind is taking on the planet or who are concerned about the lack of directions of adult education and the disarray of its present policies. One way to set forth these reasons is to acknowledge the difficulty of the task. If we are clearer why it is difficult, then we may become clearer why we should do it. Its difficulty is explained by three reasons.

(1) We do not know what constitutes the fully human. It is a condition yet to be achieved by the human race. How can we aim for anything fully human if we do not know at what we aim, i.e., if we can not see the target? But at what else should we aim?

---

[1] Warren L. Ziegler. "The Disciplines of Fully Human Policy" in May Maury Harding and Mary E. Osman, Eds. Explorations in Public Policy. Southwestern at Memphis: 1980.

(2) As we do not understand well the condition of being fully human, how could we tell when this celebrated condition has been conferred on policy? In the language of policy, what would the fully human look like? Is it not the case, anyway, that we have and do policy just because we are less than fully human? Were we, perhaps we should not need policies.

(3) A third reason is that a fully human policy for the education of adults probably contains a view of fully human education. As with the first reason, that escapes our purview.

Do these reasons call the search into question? Adult education is so eminently a practical field, why look for a fully human policy for the education of adults? What good will it do anybody involved in literacy education or industrial training or continuing professional education, etc? Indeed, by what right or reason should we attempt to encumber educational policy, whether for adults or for youth, with a quest for a fully human quality? Are not modern education and its public policies already quite close to breaking under the strain of conflicts and agendas of our society, itself in great disarray? Would not this additional criterion--the condition or quality of being fully human--simply add confusion, if not strain, to an already overburdened institution whose purposes, organizations and actions are unravelling and peeling away before our very eyes?

A counter argument

These are good reasons for not pursuing the search, but may be humanized by the following considerations. First, by asking so far-reaching a question about the fully human quality of policy for the education of adults, we may force ourselves to illuminate issues of meaning and purpose which current literature in both the policy and the adult education fields ignore to the detriment of both. Put it another way: persons satisfied with the state of adult education and its policies need read no further. The search for the fully human is grounded in a trenchant dissatisfaction with specifiable aspects of the present and in an unremitting hope for the future.

Second, against these reasons for dismantling the quest before it has hardly begun stands a very strong bulwark of collegial commitment to a search for the fully human. This is a collegial phenomenon not unlike Polanyi's humanistic and intellectual community of scientists, except that the version offered here is characterized more by the personal, in the language of John McMurray.[2] We attest to the dedication of colleagues--who know who they are--to aim for the fully human in

[2] John MacMurray. Persons in Relation. Faber and Faber, London: 1961.

their intellectual, moral and practical activities. Members of this unannounced and rarely celebrated collegium of persons can not help themselves. They are compelled to this effort by a quirk in their character or an accident in their biography. They have been given a glimpse of the fully human in one or another domains of human endeavor. They do not permit their intellectual, moral and spiritual judgements to be enslaved by the exigencies of accidental fads in educational research and practice, nor do they often fall to the blandishments of power, position and prestige. Whether in research or teaching-learning, they continually remind us that the start of the search rests on a strong belief that this is not an accidental life, nor is it an accidental society. We are co-creators of our history, personal and collective, and can not make excuses for what we have come to, whether by reason of birth or "unfortunate" influences.

Of course, if we did not stumble we would be less than human. But the collegium pulls all of us back to the search. This paper represents merely another step in the codification of the enterprise: to search out the fully human in all of its dimensions, to come to understand it, to practice it and to enable others to do likewise.

Three Central Themes

For this occasion, we deal with three ideas:

(1) First, focus on the vocabulary which separates the child from the man or woman, which speaks of adult education as distinguished from the education of youth. That polarizing vocabulary does a disservice to the search. Whatever we come to mean by the fully human must apply to all. There are interesting tactical issues in this distinction between youth and adult, but certainly none with respect to principles, ends or means. Fully human policy for the education of adults is no different from fully human policy for the education of youth. That claim will be examined below. Meanwhile, we shall no longer speak of adult education in this paper. Adult education readers of this paper are urged to continue however much they may feel upset by this claim. Let us only note that the search for fully human policy in the education of adults must certainly take us beyond the educational systems metaphors of an industrial era (i.e., school systems, higher education, post-secondary education, recurrent education, etc.) from which we are rapidly emerging.

(2) A second idea in this paper is just this: we shall consider education in its current societal meanings and functions as a barrier rather than a facilitator to the fully human. This position presents interesting problems in public policy to which we must later attend. At this moment, suffice

it to say that we search for impediments to fully human learning, resting on a vital distinction between learning and education discussed below. That educational policy which is fully human removes--or seeks to remove--those impediments.

(3) The third idea is this paper is about methodology or, more generally, the approach. This search can proceed without definitional clarity about what constitutes the fully human by virtue of the application of some interim guidelines characterized mainly by their open-ended status. This is to say, we seek and employ a set of search procedures which are open-ended and which permit a rectification of mistakes and a movement along new or alternative paths without destroying the entire enterprise in the process of that rectification. This interim mode, which includes but goes far beyond a scientific search to the domains of the human spirit poses severe consequences for current usages in public policy, educational and non-educational. Those usages and practices lead to intellectual closure, political consensus and organizational certainty exactly at a time in planetary transformation when we must keep our powder dry and increase the number of available options.

Learning and education

For some years, now, we have been caught in a quandary of trying to discuss education in a way substantially different from its current practices. It has proven difficult to make a distinction clear to colleagues, whether engaged in academe, policy circles or the citizen practices of inventing the future. Thus have we come to speak of fully human learning as distinguished from education. The possibility of the latter is generated by the possibility for the former.

But what, then, is fully human learning? In summary, it is constituted by those acts by which persons assign meanings to their experiences in such a way that they can intervene deliberately, with volition and intention, to change those experiences. In short, human learning is the assignment of actionable meanings to human phenomena. Its praxis is constituted by three acts.

(1) The first is the act of intentioning, by which we mean a great deal more than having intentions. In the sense of an Ignatius, a Jung or a Rollo May, we would understand the human spirit (or personality) as intentioning as deliberately impacting upon the world of experience, inner as well as outer, as pro-active by its nature, as trying to grasp to itself the world in order to transform it, i.e., render it actionable. In fully human learning, the act of intentioning emerges in choosing what to learn and why to learn. That choice we call

the learning stance.[3]

(2) The second act in the praxis of fully human learning is its performance or doing. The act of choosing what and why Washington, D.C.: 1979.
to learn is extended in this second act to choosing how, when and where to learn. Note that much educational policy, through its impact on the certification of delivery systems, has more to do with the how, when and where than with the what or why.

Research on out-of-school learning activities, of the kind carried on by Tough and others, indicates that when persons come to reflect upon and talk about their learning, it is these five predicates of choice about which they talk. A recent research project on out-of-school learning carried out with rural persons in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont clearly demonstrates their attention to these choices and their consequences rather than to the acquisition of information bits and pieces.[4] Even using the unholy language of skills, knowledge and attitudes, information transfer is not fully human learning, it is information transfer, which is why computers are getting increasingly good at it.

(3) The third act in this praxis lies in anticipating the consequences of the learning (and thus, these five choices). Consequences will be both for self and for others. Two points should be made. Consequences for self are typically thought of in the language of success and failure because education has been used as a selection or sorting-out device in which some persons get more than others because of educational performance of level of educational attainment. Thus has much educational policy attempted to redress the grievances of those groups--Blacks, Women, Hispanics, etc.--which the sorting-out system has selected out unfairly according to many persons. When we come to understand that fully human learning is an act of celebration of the human spirit whatever the dimensions of that learning, then the social notions of success and failure will have withered away.

The second point directly related to anticipating the consequences of these choices for self and others (the third act of the praxis of fully human learning) is that this learning invariably occurs within a community of learners. Note that a community of learners is not a learning community. Our sense is that neither societies nor communities learn. Human beings

---

[3]Warren L. Ziegler and Grace M. Healy, Eds. The Learning Stance: Essays in Celebration of Human Learning. National Institute of Education final report. Contract No. 400-78-0029.

[4]NIE Adult Learning Project. College of Education and Social Services, Burlington: University of Vermont.

learn. Fully human learning is a communitarian enterprise because the consequences of that learning play out in to the learning choices of other persons: in principles, every person on the planet; in practice, smaller groups. It is unlikely that educational policy has anything positive to do with establishing communities of learners. Possibly, as we shall later discuss, it may have a few smallish things to do with removing some of the barriers to their formation.

In this distinction between fully human learning and education, education carries the burden of legitimation. Among the fully human learnings of which we may be capable, which ones are legitimated within the structures and structures of society? We look to the educational enterprise to respond to that question. Thus, this definitional distinction places the education enterprise within the much larger domain of human learning. Definitions are not true but useful...or not, as the case may be. This distinction enables us to by-pass the organizational arrangments and institutional limitations of education and its policies without at the same time eliminating the phenomena of fully human learning, as we have defined it. In short, it permits us to talk about educative practices which may promote fully human learning in an inventive way. And, we are in desparate want of some good inventions.

What do we mean by the fully human?

This is the point at which we must bite the bullet. The first reason given for not pursuing this search was that, "We do not know what constitutes the fully human." Yet of course, like everybody else, we have some notions of what the fully human means. Indeed, it is the prevalence of these notions in all cultures which suggests that the search is universally grounded in the human spirit.

Let us start by reaffirming the first theme of this paper. Distinctions between adults and youth, in the context of the fully human, are false distinctions. We would make this claim of sexist, racist or social class distinctions. We concentrate on the age criterion because it is so central to "adult" education. These distinctions are false because a common-sensical examination of the faculties and competences of youth show them enacting their world with as much aplomb as persons who have lived longer. Predjudice against youth is not significantly different in intent or meaning than prejudice against any other persons by virtue of their being old, female, Black, Hispanic, handicapped, etc. Ultimately, the prejudice is grounded in the belief that these persons, identified as groups, are incapable of being in charge of themsleves. That is, they are less than persons. That myth has been powerfully attacked when applied to females, Blacks and Hispanics. It still is widely prevalent when applied to oldsters, youth and the physically handicapped.

To be in charge of yourself means to take the consequences of your enactments. It means not hiding from them. It means not being protected from them. With a focus on the youth-adult axis, consider these examples.

Can we claim that adults are better able to protect or enact their health than children? Certainly not if we look at the nutritional and exercise habits of adults.

Can we claim that adults are less prone to violence than children, or are in any greater control of it? Certainly not, if we look at the rampant phenomena of child abuse. Certainly not, if we but remember the events of the Twentieth Century on this planet.

Can we claim that adults are more sensitive to or are more able to nurture creatively the feelings and spirit of other persons?

Can we claim that adults are less promiscuous, more just, less afraid of risk, more courageous, more capable of learning than children?

Can we claim that adults are more prone to guilt trips, anxiety, social (peer) fears than children?

When we look at children in homes and families subjected to illness, poverty, the breakdown of parental or marital relationships, etc., we find them coping with every bit the competence of their seniors, and sometimes a great deal more: loving, nurturing, caring and taking responsibility for a variety of enactments when their parents or mentors can't.

But if we no longer distinguish, in this paper, between children and adults in the matter at hand--fully human learning--then we should be able to provide an umbrella under which they both fit and, indeed, become virtually indistinguishable. That umbrella is opened up by the philosophy of personhood. It is connoted by ideas and practices antithetical too much of modern cultural development, i.e., of the industrial era of humankind.

Personhood celebrates the person, not the machine, not capital, not wealth, not technology.

Personhood proclaims the primacy of the person as earthly end, not the state, not the nation, not the organization, not the system, not the ideology.

Personhood locates responsibility and intentionality only in the person, not in the organization. An organization can not act intentionally. It can have no goals. It acts neither responsibly nor irresponsibly. In an era of organizational

development and MBO, this is a radical set of claims. Only persons can act intentionally. Of course, they may choose to do so within an organizational ambience. We should not, therefore, talk about the goals of this or that school system or this or that university except in so far as that organizational entity is constituted by a community of persons. (That is why in futures-invention, it is crucial to enable the participants to generate their own community of learners; and if they can not do so because of their organizational or community characteristics, it is usually less than successful).

Personhood is not the same as individuality. Individuality has only the notion of human agency to save itself from the barbarians. But personhood can not exist except when actual persons are with and for other persons. Buber clearly points this out. Personhood, therefore, emerges as part of an act of ego-reduction in which we learn to transcend the manipulation and use of other human beings as objects in the name of enabling the flowering of their personhood. From this develops a community of persons, of which our special case is a community of learners who intend to help each other learn by virtue of their being persons with and for each other. In the fully human context, that community will be universal, i.e., open to and accepted by all people on the planet by virtue of their being persons.

An educational institution grounded in competition rather than in collaboration uses learning achievement as a way of assigning prestige or other benefits to one learner vis-a-vis another learner. It is antithetical to this view of personhood. But it prevails.

Note that we are not suggesting that a philosophy of personhood, characterized by these indicators and criteria, is congruent with the fully human. We are proposing that personhood is a powerful notion for encompassing people within the same metaphor irrespective of ascribed or achieved status. That enables us to talk about fully human policy for the education of persons irrespective of their chronological age.

Is there an educational test of this proposition? Does it not lie in the general failure of our educational delivery systems to any longer create or maintain a literate public? Unfortunately, literacy has come to be understood in a technical sense, as the mastery of a set of technical skills much like carpentry, motor mechanics, computer programming or organizational/administrative management. Public policies have rather effectively hidden from learners of all ages the reasons why they might choose to become literate. Literacy is a tool of enactment. It is an instrument by which we possess the world and assign to it actionable meanings. Certainly it is not the only such tool. But in an age of information deluge and an ignorance of history coupled with a state's capacity to deny

history, literacy continues to be the major device by which we are enabled to engage in an on-going reflection of the means and ends of human action. A conversation can begin this reflection, as can a movie, a TV show, a participation in or witness to events. But the reflection on the reflection is aided most by or capacity to recount the prior reflection and engage in its exegesis, whether proclaimed by an Isaiah, a Sophocles, a Lao-Tsu, an Erasmus, a used car sales contract or a letter from your mom or dad.

The institutions of modern society provide few opportunities for persons to engage in authentic human action, which has a praxis analogous to the praxis of fully human learning. Thus, persons no longer have easily accessible reasons for becoming or staying literate. We know this by virtue of the levels of illiteracy among all ages. Learners vote with their feet, or with their brains. Illiterates choose not to learn that set of tools, within their praxis, not because they are stupid but because they are smart. There is perhaps less false consciousness in them about their condition of illiteracy than among many so-called literate, affluent people. Thus do we talk about the "street smarts" to acknowledge their status as learners.

Can education policy promote the condition of personhood within its delivery systems, be they serving adults or youth, the affluent or the impoverished, the employed or the unemployed, the educational achiever or the educational non-achiever, etc.? To respond to that question, we now move to the second main theme of this paper.

Removing the impediments

To remove the impediments to fully human learning, we want to know what they are. Once identified, are they amenable to educational interventions? If so, might these educational interventions be promoted by public policies? This is the line of argument.

The impediments are defined by the acts of praxis fully human learning. That much is clear. They are impediments to choice about what, why, when, how and where to learn. Keep in mind that the choices pertain to all persons irrespective of their age; and thus we address impediments to fully human learning, not to youth or to adult education.

What, then, are the impediments?

(1) The first is the easiest and has been much written about since the days of John Locke and John Milton. All policies which interrupt or prohibit the free flow of information about learning activities and their multiple delivery systems tend to impede fully human learning. This is

the full disclosure criterion which has been in political dispute in democratic (i.e., self-governing) societies ever since it was brought in to public debate. It will be very difficult to remove this impediment as a matter of public policy, for persons who govern organizations, including educational organizations, tend to think of their organizations as persons, as thus fully capable of aggrandizement, deceipt, mistrust, survival. Full disclosure is antithetical to those organizational instruments.

(2) The second impediment has to do with those systems of rewards and punishments which make it likely the persons will choose not to learn rather than to learn. Both acts of choice are contained by a praxis. The praxis of choosing not to learn has become increasingly powerful in the modern industrial era. Policies which bestow--or tend to bestow-- noneducational benefits on persons by virtue of their acquistion of educational credentials are essential attributes of the social class praxis. They are a powerful mechanism in support of class prejudice, particularly its economic variety.

Here, there is something public policy may be able to do: the removal of educational credentials from all lists of criteria used by any part of the social structure to do anything at all to any person, actively or passively. The federal government could begin be removing educational credentials (or certified levels of attainment) from its civil service entrance examinations.

But there is a more powerful impediment here than educational credentials, which in any event are probably loosing their grip as we increasingly become an over-credentialed society. It is the educational device which promotes knowledge rather than inquiry. Knowledge and its dissemination is a great impediment to fully human learning, because we have come to understand knowledge as closure, as certainty, as power. Its possession places one person in hegemony over another. Inquiry, on the other hand, tends to be more of a facilitating, enabling, open-ended activity. Knowledge does not promote choice. Inquiry does.

Note how young persons, very much including infants engaged in intentional language learning, inquire all over the place until the oldsters tell them to stop. The first time a youngster is punished for asking a question or rewarded for not asking one is the advent of social knowledge over fully human learning. Social knowledge--the knowledge of what is required of us to acquire and maintain our membership in a society--is what education is all about. It is unlikely that we shall uncover educational policies which promote inquiry, for to do so raises too many questions about who and what we are, too many questions about violence, about prejudice, about alternative states of consciousness, about love, about injustice, about human deprivation, about environmental imbalances, etc.

(3) But there is a third impediment, which we might call the ignorant but happy syndrome. It goes hand in hand with the second impediment, which substitutes educational credentials and non-educational benefits for fully human learning. This third impediment is constituted by those social arrangements which tend to hide from the learner the consequences of his or her not learning. Usually, such consequences tend to put the person in a state of irresponsibility, i.e., not being in charge of him or herself within a specific experiential or institutional context.

Such social arrangements are grounded in the highly specialized division of labor which has given birth to the era of the expert, the use of esoteric vocabulary as an instrument of specialist aggrandizement, and the consequent demise of the citizen-humanist-generalist.

We think the ignorant but happy condition applies to most organizations of work, to most foreign policy instruments, to school systems in lower-class neighborhoods, to most hospitals and old-age homes and to the entire arena of intimate social relationships in which the practices of bonding, nurturing and affection take place. We have designed institutions for protection of ourselves from ourselves, rather than for emancipation of our enormous learning potential. This is an extraordinarily deep-seated aspect of our mental life, embedded deeply in the human culture, and not easily accessible to policy instruments. Indeed, probably just the opposite, as policies tend to be creatures of their cultures. James Reston, the eminent journalist, has been unable to secure the myriad tapes and documents on the Jonestown cult trajedy from various federal agencies, despite the Freedom of Information Act. Thus are we protected from our learning and from ourselves.

(4) A fourth barrier to fully human learning certainly lies in those policies which tend to promote one type or kind of educational institution over another. It may be in the public interest to set forth certain universal rules applicable to all units in the total educational delivery systems, such as full disclosure of all aspects of the learning environments they offer. It is not in that interest for governments to certify which of those units should receive tax dollars or other kinds of indirect public support. If it were the case that governments were wiser than citizens in these matters, then public policies which create or maintain a social hierarchy of educational institutions might make sense. But nowhere, as far as we can tell, is that the case.

This, of course, becomes a very rich area for policy invention. The one contribution which the metaphors of lifelong learning and self-directed learning may make to move public policy thrust away from degree-credit to non-credit learning environments, and to help dissolve once and for all the sociologically false and self-serving distinction between

"formal" and "informal" education. We must keep in mind this simple rule of thumb. Every time a distinction is made between one and another type or kind of education, the purpose invariably is to serve the interests of those organizations, and thus those persons, who constitute the personnel of the higher-rated type.

(5) The last impediment we shall mention here is by far the most difficult for us to acknolwedge, for to remove it runs counter to a number of good social ends. We refer, of course, to the "educational strategy", so-called because since the mid 1960's it has served as the major ostensible modus operandi for ameliorating poverty and white racism in American society. Still, fully human learning demands the elimination of all those public policies which single out any social indicator of deprivation and make it the basis for the allocation of public funds to an educational organization or program or to a member of that group to pursue educational activities, (i.e., those few aspects of human learning which are legitimated at any given moment in the cultural history of the industrial society).

There are many reasons for this position. Let us mention a couple. First, most educational organizations will use whatever public funds they can get their hands on for their own (maintenance and survival) purposes, not to improve the lot of groups deprived of their place in the sun by almost all other social mechanisms.

Second, it is very unclear if educational organizations are the best or even very good learning environments for persons who choose to take a learning stance towards social deprivation, disadvantage and prejudice. It may well be the case that those matters are best learned about (and acted upon) in other settings.

Third, an emphasis upon educational interventions in the matter of race, sex and class prejudice lays an inordinate burden on educational delivery systems and at the same time makes it easier for other mainstream institutions to avoid confronting thses issues head-on. Let us put it in the language of persons. By virtue of age criteria--mainly youth--coupled with the institutional locus of education, many if not most persons are deprived of the opportunity to confront and learn about the issues of social deprivation because responsibility for that confrontation has come to be legitimated mainly in the educational delivery systems, to which only certain persons have access.

Is there a case for education interventions promotable by public policy?

In the matter of fully human learning, there is little that public policy can do to promote it. At most, we might try to

remove some of the barriers imposed as a matter of cultural habit and practice or because some social groups lay their conditions for learning on other social groups. To repeat, this is an unlikely task just because public policies are creatures of the culture within which they are generated. Our culture neither seeks to emancipate nor to celebrate fully human learning. Popper's "open society" is rapidly closing under the onslaught of international and internal fears to which our culture tends to respond more through violence than through learning.

It is the case that public policy is not an appropriate instrument for seeking the good. Only human beings can seek the good. When we do so as a matter of public policy, we tend to create more social problems than we solve.

The question of removing barriers and impediments is another matter, if we can learn to take an inventive posture towards public policy design and formation. Such a posture, first and foremost, puts the matter of fully human learning up front and out in the open. Putting aside the difficulty of the vocabulary associated with fully human learning, how might this be done?

Probably we shall want to design into all public policies a clause which states explicitly that under no conditions shall persons be prevented from learning anything that has to do with the specific policy in question. This is not unlike a universal affirmative action or anti-discrimination clause. It does not tell persons as citizens what they must do. It says what they may not do, as a matter of law. By doing this, we may expose to public scrutiny and the possibility of learning a wide range of social ends and issues which government policies have tended either to obscure or foreclose.

Public policy, of course, constitutes a domain far more extensive, in principle, than governmental activities. Its possibility is constituted by the existence or emergence of specified publics--i.e., groups of citizens concerned about some common matter--who are prepared to confront and in reason deal with the tension and conflicts between themsleves and other groups of citizens within the broadest sweep of imagination of which they are capable. Herein are involved learning and practicing the disciplines of fully human policy.

Perhaps, then, the priority task for those persons devoted to the liberation and celebration of fully human learning is to invent new forums--new learning-action settings--within which they can learn, practice, acquire and legitimate its disciplines. In different organizational and community contexts around the country--thus, we would not in principle exclude educational delivery systems--we may learn to design a multiplicity of public policies which will be <u>educative</u> because

they enable learning. Scott Buchanan once wrote that in the city-state of classical Greek antiquity, it was understood that the laws were the teachers of men. Our laws no longer teach, i.e., facilitate the disciplines of fully human learning. We should not look to governments in our search for fully human policy about fully human learning.

We should look to ourselves.

Other publications available through the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education for purchase include:

Maryland Adult Educator	Each Copy	$ 3.00
Summer 1980 Vol. 2 No. 3		
Fall 1980 Vol. 2 No. 4		
Spring 1981 Vo. 3 No. 2		
Winter 1981 Vol. 3 No. 1		
1981 Vo. 3 No. 3 & 4		

Proceedings

1979 Lifelong Learning Research Conference edited by: Whaples & Ewert	$ 5.00
1980 Lifelong Learning Research Conference edited by: Whaples & Ewert	5.00
1981 Lifelong Learning Research Conference edited by: Whaples & Ewert	5.00
1982 Lifelong Learning Research Conference edited by: Whaples & Rivera	11.00

Please forward a check or money order to the following address for your copies:

University of Maryland
Department of Agricultural & Extension Education
Room 0220, Symons Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742